DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 470 EA 013 295

AUTHOR Fiorino, Albert
TITLE Teacher Education in Ontario: A History, 1843-1976.
INSTITUTION Commission on Declining School Enrolments in Ontario, Toronto.
REPORT NO CODE-IB-4
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 187p.: Tables may be marginally legible due to small print of original document. For related documents, see EA 013 260-308.
AVAILABLE FROM Publications Centre, Ministry of Government Services, 880 Bay St., 5th Floor, Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario M7A 1N8 Canada (Record No. ON01546/CODE00287: $2.00 microfiche).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Declining Enrollment: *Educational History: Educational Legislation: Elementary Secondary Education: Foreign Countries: Inservice Teacher Education: Schools of Education: *Teacher Education: Teacher Education Curriculum: Teacher Education Programs: Teacher Motivation: Teacher Shortage: Teacher Supply and Demand: Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Ontario: World War II

ABSTRACT

The development of teacher education in Ontario for the last century has largely been determined by the forces of supply and demand. By 1950 the province had a well-structured, highly centralized, and comprehensive system of teacher education, although progress in the raising of standards was slow due to war-time expedients and the teacher shortage throughout the 1950s and 1960s. During the past 15 years, teacher education has experienced unprecedented quantitative and qualitative growth. Faced with declining enrollment, educators must now refine past achievements in both theory and practice. Limited job opportunities in teaching provide the chance, through careful screening, to develop a highly competent and deeply committed teaching corps. For the first time in many years, policies and programs of teacher education need no longer be governed by a chronic shortage of adequately qualified candidates. (Author/WD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 197470

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

INFORMATION BULLETIN NO. 4

TEACHER EDUCATION IN ONTARIO: A HISTORY, 1843-1976

ALBERT FIORINO

APRIL, 1978

COMMISSION ON DECLINING SCHOOL ENROLMENTS IN ONTARIO (CODE)

R. W. B. JACKSON
COMMISSIONER

HOWARD B. HENDERSON
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

CA 013 235

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. M. Hildebrand
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TEACHER EDUCATION IN ONTARIO:
A HISTORY, 1843 - 1976

ALBERT FIORINO

April, 1978

This paper was commissioned by and prepared for The Commission on Declining School Enrolments in Ontario and is not to be cited or quoted without the permission of the Commission and the author.

This study reflects the views of the author and not necessarily those of the Commission or the Ministry of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents ii

List of Tables v

Part

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Notes 6

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION: 1843-1950 7

A. The Training of Elementary School Teachers 8

1. The Making of a Teacher in the 1840's 8

2. The Common School Act of 1843 12

3. The Ryerson Years: 1844-1876 14

a. The Report of 1846 14

b. The Establishment of the Toronto Normal School and Other Early Developments 16

c. The Organization of Teachers' Institutes. 21

d. The School Act of 1871. 22

e. The Opening of a Second Normal School 27

4. The Establishment of County Model Schools 27

5. The Regulations of 1877 29

6. The Introduction of Kindergarten-Teacher Training . . . 30

7. The Creation of District Model Schools. 31

8. Other Important Changes and Developments: 1877-1927 32

9. The Introduction of Higher Standards: 1927-1939 36

10. The War-Time Emergency Measures 38

B. The Training of Secondary School Teachers 41

1. Training and Certification Requirements During Ryerson's Superintendency 41

2. Changes Made Under Crooks' Ministry 42

3. The Formation of Training Institutes. 43

4. The Development of the Ontario Normal College 44

5. The Establishment of the Ontario College of Education 46

C. The Preparation of Vocational Teachers 47

D. Summation 50

Notes 52

III. POST-WAR READJUSTMENT AND GROWTH: 1950-1965. 55

A. Background 56

B. Key Documents. 60

1. The Hope Report 60

2. The Bowers Report 65

3. The O.P.S.M.T.F. Proposal. 68

C. Teacher Education 73

1. Physical Facilities. 73

2. Admission and Certification Requirements in 1950 . . 77

a. Of Elementary School Teachers. 77
b. Of Secondary School Teachers 79
c. Of Vocational School Teachers 80
d. For In-Service Education 81

3. The Emergency Plan of 1952-53 for the Training of Elementary School Teachers 83

4. The 1955 Emergency Plan for the Training of Secondary School Teachers 86

5. The Institutionalization of In-Service Education . . 90

6. The Hatten Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers in 1961. 96

7. The Staff Conference Report of 1964. 104

8. The Establishment of O.I.S.E. in 1965. 109

9. Other Significant Changes and Developments 114

10. The Ideal Teacher and Teacher Education 123

Notes 131

IV. A DECADE OF TRANSITION AND CHANGE: 1966-1976 138

A. Background 139
B. The MacLeod Report 141
C. The Integration of Teachers' Colleges and Universities . . . 146
D. Living and Learning on Teacher Education 149
E. The Retention of O.T.E.C. 154
F. The York University Model 157
G. Developments in Secondary School Teacher Education 160
H. The McEwan Committee on the Costs of Education 164
I. Summary. 168
Notes 170

V. CONCLUDING REMARKS 172
Notes 176

Bibliography 177

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	September school enrolment, Ontario 1944-1966	57
Table 2:	Enrolment in elementary and secondary schools of Ontario, 1945-70	57
Table 3:	Enrolment in Ontario's teachers' colleges, 1945-70. . .	87
Table 4:	Enrolment in Ontario colleges of education by course and program	87
Table 5:	Enrolment in Department of Education summer courses, 1945-65.	95
Table 6:	Classification of teachers in publicly-controlled schools according to certificate, 1950.	129
Table 7:	Certificates -- all teachers and principals, eight provinces, 1965-66.	129
Table 8:	All teachers and principals by highest university degree, eight provinces, 1965-66.	130

Part I

INTRODUCTION

The history of formal teacher training in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century runs parallel to the movement for universal public education. The latter development was the logical outcome of a confluence of social, economic, intellectual, and religious forces which during this same period were rapidly transforming the existing social order. Social and economic forces became expressed through commercial rivalry intensified by an expanded and flourishing trade market in the New World, and through the industrial revolution; thus causing a rise in the middle class, mass labor, urbanization, and a prevailing sense of nationalism. These forces were tempered by the growth of political ideologies, particularly in continental Europe, and by an ardent religious revival in England (spearheaded by Wesleyan Methodism) which emphasized the welfare of the common man.[1] In continental Europe and North America these ideologies inspired what have been called the "democratic revolutions", which tended to bring an end to hierarchical forms of government and institute new democratic republics wherein the worth and rights of the individual reigned supreme.[2] In England, a dynamic religious renaissance occurred which, while checking revolutionary tendencies, had the twofold effect of giving hope to a people filled with anxiety created by an evolving industrial society and of re-affirming their value as creatures of a beneficent God.

The resulting social order had concomitant effects on education. No longer would education be restricted to the privileged few. The new social system demanded an enlightened citizenship, a literate population, a more highly skilled labour force, and a strictly disciplined people who would en masse promote the progress of the nation. From a theological

perspective, this meant that every individual had a right to an education in order to fulfill his role of Christian citizenship. An important consequence of these developments was the gradual realization that education should be the responsibility of the state and of its corollary that the state should have the right to levy taxes in order to secure education for all. The acceptance of these views led to the gradual establishment of systems of public instruction throughout Europe and North America. As these systems emerged, so did a demand for teachers and teacher training institutions.

Pre-service and in-service education of teachers first began in Germany with the establishment in 1706 of a seminary for the preparation of prospective male candidates at Halle. By the end of the eighteenth century there were thirty such training schools in Germany. Each school was also responsible for maintaining contact with all teachers within a six-mile radius and some even offered refresher courses for teachers in service.

Normal schools did not appear on the scene until the early nineteenth century. The first such school was established by Napoléon in 1808 and was called the Ecole Normale and later renamed the Ecole Normale Supérieure. The school was intended to train teachers for the lycées. Under the influence of Wilhelm von Humboldt, similar institutions were built in Germany in 1809. In England, the first teacher training institution was not created until 1835 replacing the no longer adequate monitorial systems of Andrew Bell and Joseph Lancaster. A year earlier, in 1834, David Stow had founded the Glasgow Normal Seminary whose graduates ventured

forth to all parts of the Empire. The first state-controlled school in the United States was founded in 1839 by Horace Mann with the establishment of a normal school in Lexington, Massachusettes. This school became a model for subsequent developments in other states of the union.

During the nineteenth century, normal schools and other types of teacher training institutions mushroomed throughout the Western World in response to the growing enrolments in the schools. As the retention rate of students increased and more individuals proceeded in their studies beyond the elementary level, so did the need for more teachers, and especially for instructors possessing higher academic qualifications and specialist's certificates. However, attempts to raise the standards of teacher education in the nineteenth century (and this would also be true in the twentieth century), would be periodically hampered by serious teacher shortages produced primarily by uncontrollable socio-economic factors (viz., economic slumps, depressions, wars) and aggravated by high attrition rates in the profession caused in many instances by the low remuneration received by teachers for their work. In dealing with such problems, especially during critical times, governments, conscious of their prime responsibility to their electorate, tended to exercise restraint and expediency at the expense of the improvement in the quality of teacher education. One can only speculate whether or not modern governments, given the complexity of their concerns, loyalties and responsibilities, could have acted otherwise. On the other hand, one can also speculate whether or not quality or high standards in the schools and in teacher education are necessarily contingent upon the existence

of favourable socio-economic conditions in a given society. The history of teacher education in Ontario and other countries in the West equally 'begs' both kinds of questions.

Notes

1. For an elaboration of the latter view see Bernard Semmel, "Elie Halévy, Methodism and Revolution," Introduction to Elie Halévy, The Birth of Methodism in England, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971; and The Methodist Revolution, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

2. The term "democratic revolution" has been derived from R.R. Palmer's work, The Age of the Democratic Revolution. A Political History of Europe and America, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959.

Part II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION: 1843-1950

A. The Training of Elementary School Teachers

1. The Making of a Teacher in the 1840's

The year was 1842. After a long and arduous crossing of the Atlantic Ocean, Robert Phillips of Dunning, Scotland, found himself on terra firma in New York. Though a long way from home, his journey was not yet completed. He was yet to travel to Upper Canada via the route of the day, Albany - Syracuse - Oswego. Relieved that this last stretch of his journey would not be as lengthy as his sea voyage, he set out to make his fortune.

Along the way, he made enquiries regarding employment prospects in Upper Canada. The town of Kingston was described as 'thriving' and he set his sights in that direction. However, his efforts to find employment there were to no avail. He was then advised to travel farther west along the lake to Bath, where there were some small factories which might require help. There, too, he found no success.

Five miles from Bath, Phillips tried to find work at a mill. Determined and hopeful, he fantasized about the great possibilities in the woollen industry. This would be a great opportunity to establish himself in a financially rewarding business and thus fulfill the dreams of which he had boasted to his friends back in Scotland. Reality, however, struck yet another blow. The owner of the mill, Michael Asselstine, could not offer him a job -- the factory was fully staffed. The refusal felt like an insult and a rejection of his personal worth. Eyes brimming with tears, he shook hands with Asselstine and set out to return to Bath.

Realizing the young man's desperation, Asselstine called Phillips back. After enquiring about whether he could spell and perform basic arithmetic operations, Mr. Asselstine asked Robert if he was interested

in becoming the local teacher. He could read and write, knew the basics of arithmetic and, for his age, twenty, he was a rather mature and intelligent young man. But teaching was the last thing on his mind. He had come to Canada to engage in commerce and acquire great wealth, not to teach. Nevertheless, in his circumstances, he could not afford to be too selective and so he was willing to listen to what Mr. Asselstine had to tell him.

Asselstine explained to him that elementary education was barely organized in Upper Canada. Even though some form of government subsidy was forthcoming, it was still the prime responsibility of the parents in the community to pay the major share of education costs. The teacher was appointed locally after being examined by a school commissioner, who, in this case, was Mr. Asselstine himself. The school to which he would be assigned brought in forty-eight pounds a year including full board. No other qualifications would be required of him. Having no alternate route to take, Robert reluctantly expressed his interest in the position and enquired about making arrangements for an examination. As school commissioner, Mr. Asselstine quickly obliged him and proposed to Robert the following set of questions: How do you spell the word "accommodate"?, What is the fourth part of forty-eight?, What is the capital of France?, and What is one of the principal crops of the southern states of North America? Robert answered all these four questions correctly and was immediately appointed teacher by Mr. Asselstine, who assured him that he would do quite well in education.

The above story summarizes Chapter Twelve of Robert A. Stevens' privately printed book The Path We Came By (1973), in which the author traces the steps of his great-grandfather, Robert Phillips, through a somewhat successful yet unfulfilling teaching career into the pharmaceutical business.[1] In the process, the author describes for the reader the "path" followed by early educational developments in Ontario and clearly depicts the kind of individual who was selected to provide elementary instruction in the schools. Availability and a rudimentary knowledge of the 3 R's were the only requirements for teaching. Furthermore, the author is quite successful in conveying to the reader the primitive state in which one found public education in the early 1840's.

Solely through his own self-improvement and dedication, Robert Phillips became a very able and successful teacher. However, during these times, his case was the exception. The majority of teachers were ill-prepared, undependable transients of questionable morals. Most of them considered teaching a tolerable, temporary arrangement which they abandoned as soon as they were able to find another more lucrative position. In 1831, in a Report to the House of Assembly, Dr. Charles Duncombe expressed the same view in much stronger terms:

> "The insufficiency of the Common School Fund to support competent, respectable and well-educated Teachers, has degraded Common School teaching from a regular business to a mere matter of convenience to transient persons or common idlers, who often stay for but one reason, and leave the Schools vacant until they accommodate some other like person; whereby the minds of the youth of this Province are left without due cultivation, or what is still worse, frequently, with vulgar, low-bred, vicious and intemperate examples before them in the persons of their monitors."[2]

In many instances the community itself was primarily responsible for the very creation of these conditions. In order to keep school costs to a bare minimum, the people hired the lowest 'bidder' for the post. Writing in 1831 to the editor of the Christian Guardian, a local teacher deplored this common practice thusly:

> "There is a custom in our land which justly deserves to be reprobated.... A few neighbours get together and say, 'We must have a school in our neighbourhood! Then to work they go,-- pile up a few logs and call it a school house! What next? 'We must have a teacher, -- one that we will keep cheap' -- it is worth but little to teach it -- if a teacher gets his board and his clothes washed and mended, he ought to be content! And with this some, so-called, teachers are contented, and the people are contented with them!"[3]

By the early 1840's no significant steps had been taken to improve the quality of teaching in the schools. The short-lived Common School Act of 1841 contained no specific provision for the selection and preparation of teachers, apart from Clause VII dealing with the election of school commissioners, who had the duty, among others, of appointing and dismissing teachers. The Reverend Robert Murray, the newly appointed Assistant Superintendent of Education, expressed grave disappointment for this omission and assured the public that he would do his utmost in pressing for legislation in this area. He thus asserted:

> "I cannot refrain from expressing my sorrow that the Teachers of Common Schools have hitherto neither been protected, provided for, nor respected as the Teachers of youth ought to be: but you may rest assured, that whatever influence I possess from my present appointment, shall be exerted in securing the protection, comfort and respectability of Common School Teachers."[4]

2. The Common School Act of 1843

On June 9, 1843, the House of Assembly passed another Common School Act for Upper Canada alone, which superseded the Act of 1841. The Act of 1843 was much more comprehensive than that of 1841 and contained, for the first time in the history of Upper Canada, a provision for the formal training of teachers. It called for the establishment of a model school in each township, the teacher of which was to receive a larger share than other instructors of the school fund provided he gave free instruction to the other teachers in the township. Clause LXI of the Act made it mandatory for the trustees of any township to obtain prior approval in writing from the county superintendent regarding the appointment of model school teachers and the making of regulations for the internal administration of the same school.[5] Under this clause, the county superintendent was also given the power to suspend or dismiss the model school teacher if circumstances warranted it, and to fill the resulting vacancy with a candidate of his own choosing if after thirty days the trustees had failed to act themselves on this matter.[6] Finally, the clause gave the county superintendent the power to make whatever regulations he deemed necessary to best serve the internal administration of the model school.[7] This clause of the Act is of particular interest since it clearly reflected the role the government would gradually assume in teacher education. Beginning with this clause, all future school legislation affecting teacher training would further reinforce the control of the Department of Education in this field. However, in this regard, the Act of 1843 did not adequately fulfill the politicians' aspirations

for greater centralization. In the end, the Act left it to the people themselves, or their representatives, to make the final decision regarding the actual establishment of a model school in their community.

The Act of 1843 also anticipated the establishment of a normal school in the near future. Thus, Clause LXII stipulated that when the normal school became operational no person should be appointed teacher of a normal school unless he could produce to the county superintendent a certificate of qualification signed by one or more professors or principal of the normal school.[8]

The legislation introduced in 1843 fell far short of the reforms that people like Mahlon Burwell and Dr. Charles Duncombe vociferously demanded and fought for during the 1830's. However, it was a beginning in the right direction. And, even though the model schools would not prove to be a success, the clauses of the Act on teacher education were a clear indication that both politicians and legislators had come to realize that immediate action was necessary to provide the young and developing system of public instruction with mature and able teachers. However, whether or not the new breed of teachers entering the system after formal training would make a firmer commitment to their work was questionable in light of the high attrition experienced over subsequent years. Many a Robert Phillips, even after years of successful teaching, would leave for what they considered greener pastures.

3. The Ryerson Years: 1844-1876

a. The Report of 1846

In October, 1844, Egerton Ryerson replaced Robert Murray as Assistant Superintendent of Education for Canada West. Murray was appointed professor of mathematics at King's College. In November, 1844, Ryerson left for Europe on the first of five educational tours that he would make during his long stay in office. On his return, he wrote and submitted to the Provincial Secretary, Dominick Daly, his Report on a System of Public Instruction for Upper Canada (1846), wherein he detailed the components of his system of public instruction and proposed his objectives for teacher education. Emulating efforts of educators from countries he had visited, especially the examples from Prussia and Ireland, combining them with the most current knowledge in the field and his own educational experience, Ryerson went on, during his thirty-two years as Superintendent, to provide the groundwork for future developments in teacher education.

Ryerson shared the view, with other leading spokesmen on education in the province, that, "There cannot be good Schools without good Teachers; nor can there be, as a general rule, good Teachers, any more than good Mechanics, or Lawyers, or Physicians, unless, persons are trained for the profession".[9] He anticipated three advantages that would result from a proper training of teachers. First, teacher training would elevate teaching to the status of a profession.[10] Of course, this would not come automatically with the institution of the first normal school. In fact, it would take another ninety-eight years before the Ontario government would give legal recognition to teachers as a professional body. Ryerson himself was not

so much concerned about legal recognition as he was about the realization by the teacher of his own self-importance. "A Teacher", he wrote in 1850, "cannot be made respectable by an Act of Parliament. He must make himself so. In every ordinary employment of life, a man who acts upon high principles, and shows that he understands and values his business, will invariably command respect."[11] Back in 1846, Ryerson argued that some form of teacher training would surely raise the teacher's image in the eyes of the community and encourage more genuinely dedicated and able individuals to enter teaching -- "The all-important and noble vocation of School-teaching will be honoured; and School-Teachers will respect themselves, and be respected as other professional men."[12]

Second, formal training would mean a higher financial return. Ryerson was of the opinion that formal training, implying a raising of teachers' qualifications, increased the demand for teachers and thus the remuneration for services provided. "Increase its value (of teaching) by rendering it more attractive and useful, and the offered remumeration for it will advance in a corresponding ratio".[13] Ryerson demonstrated the validity of this basic economic principle by pointing out how in places in both Europe and the United States, where normal schools had been built, the demand for teachers far exceeded the supply.[14] This would certainly not be the case in Canada West, where he believed one normal school would not be sufficient to meet the required supply.[15] The truism of this economic principle can be corroborated clearly by a study of the relationship between teachers' qualifications and their salaries down through the years. However, eventually it would not be higher qualifications alone that

would cause corresponding increases in salaries. Highly organized and mobilized teachers' organizations would be able to exert a powerful influence in this respect.

Third, Ryerson believed that pre-service training of teachers would "cause a great saving of time to pupils, and expense to parents and guardians".[16] The well-trained teacher, it was assumed, would possess the facilities and resources by which to expedite the educative process and thus yield a greater return to both student and parent or guardian, the investors. This third advantage would be voiced frequently by Ryerson in subsequent years placing greater stress, however, on the benefits of public education in general in an attempt to increase investments in his enterprise.

b. The Establishment of the Toronto Normal School and Other Early Developments

Ryerson's recommendation in the Report of 1846 for the establishment of a normal school in Canada West was incorporated in the Common School Act of 1846. The Act provided for the appropriation of funds to cover initial capital expenditures and an annual grant for the support of the new Normal School, which was to be located in Toronto. The Act also made provision for the creation of a General Board of Education for the province, consisting of the Superintendent of Schools, and not more than six others, appointed by the Governor. The new Normal School was placed under the authority of the Board and the general superintendence of Ryerson. The Board's control over the Normal School was total as dictated by the Act -- "To adopt all needful measurements for the establishment and furnishing of a Normal School for Upper Canada...and to do all other lawful

things which they may deem expedient to promote the objects and interests of such School."[17] The Board and future Department of Education officials would, with unwavering faith, rigorously and scrupulously fulfill this duty.

The Board's first task was to provide physical facilities for the Normal School by refurbishing the old Government House. The School was officially opened on November 1st, 1847 under the direction of its first headmaster, Thomas Jaffray Robertson. During the first session admission was restricted to men. Women would be admitted the following session commencing in May, 1848. Plans to form a boys' model school adjoining the Normal School did not materialize until February of the following year. Shortly thereafter a girls' model school was also established. However, with the relocation of the seat of government from Montreal to Toronto in 1849, new plans had to be devised to arrange more permanent facilities for the teacher training institution. This resulted in the erection of the Normal and model schools, which were ready for opening in November, 1852.

While the Normal School was experiencing occupancy problems,the county model schools were having difficulties of their own. From the very beginning the schools failed to win the necessary grass-roots support to make their operation feasible. It is also very doubtful whether or not they received adequate endorsement from the members of the Legislature. In his circular to town reeves, dated August 12, 1850, Ryerson comments:

> "The attempts of district councils to establish Model Schools have thus far proved entire failures.... The late district councils have

> in every instance, except one, abandoned the attempt.... To the success and usefulness of a Model School, a model teacher, at any expense, is indispensable, and then a Model Schoolhouse, properly furnished, and their judicious and energetic management."[18]

The implication in the latter statement was clear, the necessary funding and material resources had not been forthcoming. Thus, by the Schools Act of 1850, the county model school were replaced by the township model schools. These were elementary schools specially designed to provide teachers and prospective teachers the opportunity to observe current pedagogical methods and practices. Both the county and township model schools marked a beginning in the in-service education of teachers in Ontario.

A candidate seeking admission to the Normal School had to fulfill four basic conditions: 1) he had to be at least sixteen years of age; 2) he had to be able to produce a certificate of good moral character signed by a minister or a clergyman of the denomination to which he belonged; 3) he had to be able to read and write intelligently, and possess a rudimentary knowledge of arithmetic; 4) he had to be willing to make a written declaration of his intention to devote himself to the teaching profession. Individuals who did not intend to pursue a teaching career were admitted, but were required to pay a prescribed fee and were not eligible for a living allowance. On the other hand, those making the declaration received free books and a living allowance of five shillings per week and were exempted from paying any tuition fee. However, they were required to lodge and board in lodging houses approved by the General Board of Education.

The Normal School began by offering two five-month courses a year.

Twenty students were admitted on the first day of classes. Within a few weeks this number climbed to fifty-four. The first session ended in April, 1848 and the second session commenced the following month with an attendance of 118 students, twenty of whom were women. Up to ninety of those who registered for the session were already in service and, in Ryerson's words, had come to Normal School "to qualify themselves better for the duties of their profession".[19] For the first nine sessions, graduates received only a certificate of attendance. In order to obtain certification for teaching, they were still required to submit themselves to a County Board examination. The Schools Act of 1850 created a Board of Public Instruction for each county, consisting of the board of trustees for the county grammar school and the local superintendent or superintendents. Clause XXIX of the Act gave this Board the power to issue certificates of qualification to teachers of common schools and to place teachers into three classes according to their attainments and ability.[20] These certificates were either general (valid throughout the county) or limited as to time and place. They required ratification by a majority of the Board and the signature of at least one superintendent of schools. In instituting this procedure, Ryerson hoped to minimize the abuses that had been experienced under the previous arrangement. In order to assist the members of the Board in making prudent and wise decisions in their evaluation of candidates, Ryerson provided them with a Programme and Instructions according to which their assessment was to be determined. Nevertheless, certification remained with a body of individuals who had very little direct knowledge of the educational process and would, for this basic reason, continue to be subject, if not to gross abuse, to

incompetent management. In 1853, Ryerson introduced a certificate which had province-wide recognition for Normal School graduates only. This in effect excused Normal School graduates from having to take the county examinations and reduced the power of the local Board of Public Instruction over certification, at least with respect to one class of teachers.

In 1858, the Council of Public Instruction (instituted by the Act of 1850 to replace the Provincial Board of Education) took additional steps to extend further its control over the certification of teachers. It empowered the County Boards to issue certificates of three classes and prescribed detailed requirements for each class. At the same time, the Council introduced two provincial certificates that it would issue directly to Normal School graduates -- First Class and Second Class provincial certificates. The acquisition of a First Class provincial certificate was issued after two sessions at Normal School, while the Second Class provincial certificate required attendance for at least one session. In addition to acquiring more control over certification, by the regulations of 1853 the Council of Public Instruction strategically created a class distinction between Normal School graduates and other teachers. This move was designed to attract more teachers and potential candidates to attend the Normal School and thus improve the quality of public instruction. In spite of the prestige and higher status that was accorded to Normal School graduates, the majority of teachers during this period had no formal teacher training and possessed only County Board certificates.

c. The Organization of Teachers' Institutes

In an effort to provide the large number of untrained teachers with an opportunity for self-improvement while in service, Ryerson authorized, through the Act of 1850, the holding of a teachers' institute in each county. An institute was a meeting of teachers assembled for two, four, or ten days, as long as four weeks for the purpose of their professional development.[21] Ordinarily, it did not last for more than five days. The program consisted of a series of formal lectures given by staff members of the Normal School, group exercises and discussion, and the presentation of model lessons. Twenty institutes were organized for 1850 and several others were arranged for the ensuing years. In 1859, Ryerson once again enacted legislation to create teachers' institutes, but he did not act on this provision until 1871.[22] Even so, in his 1871 Annual Report he recommended a limited application of this provision for the year 1873.[23] Ryerson was phasing out the institutes since they had failed to fulfill the purpose for which they were established. There was not at this time a sufficient number of high calibre teachers nor competent superintendents to provide the kind of leadership ability required for the conduct of these institutes.

However, the institutes were not a complete failure. The institutes provided an occasion for teachers to fraternize and to deepen the <u>ésprit de corps</u> which they were already developing through their local meetings and their County Teachers' Associations. These Associations would replace the institutes in assisting their membership to meet some of their professional needs and would gradually evolve into well organized provincial associations that would play key roles in effecting educational change.

d. The School Act of 1871

The next major developments in teacher education did not occur until 1871 with the enactment of a new and comprehensive School Act. This was to be the last significant piece of school legislation introduced by Ryerson. Its scope was paramount. Thereafter, common schools would be known as public schools, to which admission was now made free and as such were wholly supported by property taxes. The Act made it mandatory for every child in the province, from seven to twelve years of age, to attend school for at least four months of the year. It reorganized the secondary schools of the province. Grammar schools were redesignated high schools. It made provision for the expansion of the high school curriculum, placing equal stress on both liberal and commercial subjects; and established a permanent Board of Examiners, consisting of the inspector of public schools, the chairman of the High School Board, and the headmaster of the high school, to monitor the quality of students advancing to high school. Another relevant aspect of this new Act was its provision for the establishment of collegiate institutes. This was done with a view to preventing the possible extinction of the classics from the high school curriculum. The Act outlined the standard which had to be reached in a high school before it could qualify for recognition as a collegiate institute. This included an average daily attendance of at least sixty boys in Greek, or Latin and the presence of four masters on staff. The basis of the distinction between a high school and a collegiate institute would change in the 1880's from the latter standard to examination results obtained in a given year.

The significance of the above provisions to teacher education was far-reaching. The mandatory attendance clause in the public schools meant a greater demand for more teachers. The reorganized secondary school program provided a better academic preparation of prospective teachers, thus permitting the Normal School to concentrate its efforts more on the professional training of its students. A brief perusal of the program of study offered at the Toronto Normal School during the period preceding the Act of 1871 shows a great concentration in academic subjects. The state of the matter was clearly expressed by John Sangster, Headmaster at the Toronto Normal School, writing in 1869:

> "This Institution (the Normal School) is designed to train Common School Teachers, so as to fit them for the more efficient discharge of their varied and important duties. Although essentially a training, rather than a mere School of Instruction, in the ordinary sense of the term, the majority of those received as students-in-training are so deficient in scholastic attainments that it is found necessary to include in its Course of Instruction, not merely discussions on the principles of education and methods of teaching, but also the actual teaching of most, or all, of the branches of Common School study.... More than nine-tenths of those who apply for admission to the Normal School do not possess anything like the amount of information and general knowledge which the advancing spirit of the age very properly demands on the part of those who would become Educators of youth."[24]

In addition, the entrance examinations required of public-school students advancing to high school further ensured that a higher quality of candidates would seek admission to the Normal School. Finally, the provision for the establishment of collegiate institutes and the standards by which a high school could qualify for such recognition

encouraged schools to develop a departmental system of teaching, with each departmental subject area headed by a specialist and staffed by competent teachers. This development would in subsequent years cause the raising of requirements for secondary-school teacher certification and the development of specialist courses to meet the diversifying needs of the expanding high school curriculum.

In order to upgrade the quality of teachers entering the field directly from secondary school, a provision was included in the same Act to establish a more competent local body of examiners. Thus the Act called for the creation of a County Board of Examiners, which consisted of three to five members possessing qualifications which were prescribed by the Council of Public Instruction.[25] The Board, which would be appointed by the local Council of Public Instruction, had to include at least one county inspector and persons holding any of the following qualifications: a headmastership in a high school, a degree from a British university with no less than three years of teaching experience, and a First Class Certificate. The Act empowered the Board of Examiners to assess and classify prospective teachers for the public schools in accordance with a uniform program and papers of examinations prescribed by the Council of Public Instruction. It may be noted that this provision had been strongly recommended by the Ontario Association of Teachers (founded in 1861 and initially known as the Teachers' Association of Canada West).[26] The Board received the authority to issue two classes of certificates to successful candidates. The lower of the two certificates issued by the Board was valid for three years and was renewable only under special circumstances. In placing such a

restriction on holders of this certificate, Ryerson hoped that capable and diligent teachers would be ready by the end of the three-year period to qualify themselves for the higher certificate. Those who could not achieve this did not deserve, according to Ryerson, to remain in the classroom. Hence, in order to qualify for the higher certificate (equivalent to a Second Class Certificate), a teacher had to have three years of successful teaching experience and pass the prescribed examination papers. The higher certificate was valid in all the municipalities of the province and permanent during life, or good behaviour. Under the new Act, teachers in-service were also eligible for the examination for the First-Class Provincial Certificate. Responding to a suggestion made by the Ontario Teachers' Association, Ryerson included in the Act a provision qualifying candidates with five years of successful teaching experience, or two years for those in possession of a Second Class Certificate, for the examination of the Provincial Certificate.[27] Successful candidates were not only issued a First Class Certificate by the Council of Public Instruction, but, if they had received a first grade (A) in their examination papers, became eligible for the office of County Inspector of Public Schools. Lastly, under the Act of 1871, Normal School graduates continued to receive their First Class certificates directly from the Council of Public Instruction.

By way of summary, it can be said that the Act in effect eliminated the Third Class Certificate; empowered the County Boards of Examiners to issue two classes of certificates (the lower and the higher),

of which the higher was equivalent to a Second Class Certificate; made the higher or Second Class Certificate valid throughout the province; and restricted the issuance of the First Class Provincial Certificate to the Council of Public Instruction. Ryerson considered the new higher or Second Class Certificate equal in standard to the First Class Certificate and the lower certificate equal to a Second Class Certificate issued under previous Acts. Thus, Ryerson viewed the new classification as a definite step in raising the certification requirements. This move was not well received by teachers, since it made it more difficult than ever before to attain a First Class Certificate. In subsequent years these new regulations caused many teachers who did not qualify for renewal of their lower class (Third Class) certificates to abandon teaching. Others left for other occupations which offered higher remuneration and greater opportunities. The result was that a greater number of schools were once again staffed with transients. Moreover, as attendance in the schools began to rise, a teacher shortage developed, causing many boards to employ "monitors" or "assistants" to alleviate the situation. This further undermined the quality of instruction. Nevertheless, Ryerson was convinced that the new school laws would "prove (to be) the greatest legislative boon for the educational advancement of the Country which has been conferred upon it since 1850".[28] He was equally convinced that the new classification would encourage more teachers in service to obtain professional training. Thus, he proudly reports, in a postcript to his reply to objections raised regarding the high standards of the Act of 1871, that a total of 180 students had been

admitted to Normal School for the fall session of 1871.[29] The figure represented a significant increase over previous sessions. But most importantly, it included a majority of teachers in service and, on the whole, a group of candidates who were on admission more qualified academically than any other previous group.

e. The Opening of a Second Normal School

In 1871, in order to accommodate the increase in Normal School enrolments and the professional needs of teachers in other parts of the province, Ryerson recommended to the government the establishment of two more teacher training institutions -- one in the eastern and the other in the western section of the province. A year later, in a letter to Alexander Mackenzie, the Provincial Treasurer, Ryerson changed the number to three -- one at London, one at Kingston, and the other at Ottawa.[30] He further suggested that if all three could not be built at once, preference be given to Ottawa as the first expansion location.[31] The government would not take immediate action on his proposal. However, by the time of his retirement as Chief Superintendent in 1876, the government had already established a normal school in Ottawa (in 1875). But it would take more than twenty years after that date before the normal school system experienced additional expansion.

4. The Establishment of County Model Schools

When in 1876 Ontario's first Minister of Education, Adam Crooks, took office, it was quite apparent that there was an immediate need to expand the province's teacher training facilities. Although such an

expansion program seemed most desirable, Crooks did not think it was financially feasible.[32] Furthermore, he did not believe that the establishment of more normal schools added more qualified teachers to the system.[33] The number of graduates would be merely sufficient to replace the vacancies caused by attrition. He looked for other more ready means by which to improve the skills of his growing staff of teachers, approximating 6000 in the late seventies. In 1877, Crooks introduced the necessary legislation to establish fifty county model schools. These model schools were intended to be actual training centres of teachers, as opposed to mere places of observation or practice-teaching as they had been under Ryerson. Thus, in the Regulations of 1877, the Minister required the County Board of Examiners to select one school in each county as a model school.[34] It was further stipulated that the principal of such a school hold a First Class Certificate and his assistants at least a Second Class Certificate.[35] Initially, the model school offered two eight-week sessions per year. In 1883, this was changed to one thirteen-week session per year, increased to fifteen weeks in 1888, and in 1892 reduced to fourteen.

The basic admission requirement to a model school was possession of a non-professional Third Class (lower) Certificate granted by the County Board of Examiners under the Act of 1871. Graduates of the model school program received a Third Class (professional) Certificate from the County Board of Examiners. This Certificate was valid only in the county given and for three years only and was not renewable except on recommendation of the county inspector. Moreover, the Regulations of

1877 made it possible for holders of Third Class certificates, on the recommendation of the county inspector, to write the qualifying examination for the Second Class Certificate before the expiry date.[36]

The model schools were a relatively inexpensive and effective way of providing some form of teacher training to every teacher in the system. Nevertheless, they did not in the long run help to upgrade the qualifications of teachers or encourage them to seek advanced training. Rather they helped to perpetuate and maintain the same kinds of abuses that prevailed during the Ryerson years, e.g., entry of more transients into the profession, high attrition rates, and underbidding practices. Writing approximately twenty years after the discontinuation of county model schools in 1907, J.G. Althouse made the following comments on the effect of these training centres on the teaching profession:

> "The effect of the Model Schools upon the status of the profession was devastating. This statement is not to be construed as a reflection upon the ability, good faith or devotion of the Model School masters. For thirty years these men, scandalously over-worked, were the chief support of the school system of Ontario. That the mere boys and girls who came to occupy more than half of the teaching posts of the Province were able to carry on at all is proof enough of the stimulating and invigorating influence of the Model School Principals. In spite of their efforts and example, however, the Model Schools accelerated, rather than checked, certain tendencies which were threatening to lower the standing of teachers in the Province."[37]

5. The Regulations of 1877

The Regulations of 1877 also transferred the authority for issuing Second Class certificates from the County Board of Examiners to the Department of Education.[38] Now all candidates seeking to acquire a certificate had to be, at the very least, holders of a professional

Third Class Certificate. A teacher holding a Third Class Certificate, after three years of successful teaching experience, was eligible to take the examination for the Second Class Certificate. A teacher holding a Third Class Certificate, with less than three years of teaching experience, was required, after passing the examination, to take one session at the Normal School in order to qualify for the Second Class Certificate. As in the School Act of 1871, the certificate was valid throughout the province and during life or good behaviour.

The Regulations of 1877 did not make any changes to the qualification requirements for the First Class Certificate. They did include, however, an incentive to university graduates from any part of the "British Dominions" who were interested in pursuing a teaching career in Ontario by admitting them directly to the examination for the First Class Certificate without requiring them to hold the other two certificates.[39] The regulations also recognized teachers holding First or Second Class certificates from anywhere in the British Dominions and admitted them to the examination for the Ontario equivalent provided, of course, they could present evidence attesting to their good moral character and teaching experience.[40] The intent of these particular regulations was obvious. The system was not producing a sufficiently high number of professionally trained teachers with advanced standing and the Department was making an attempt to tap external sources.

6. The Introduction of Kindergarten-Teacher Training

By 1882, plans were already in progress to introduce the kindergarten into Ontario's public schools. James L. Hughes, a public school

inspector, had been asked by the Department to visit and study the public school kindergartens of St. Louis. In May, 1882, he submitted his report to the Minister, Adam Crooks, wherein he strongly recommended the establishment of kindergartens and the development of a short course for the preparation of kindergarten teachers.[41] It was not until 1885, however, that kindergartens officially became an integral part of the public school system and kindergarten-training schools were established in connection with the normal schools at Ottawa and Toronto. The training schools offered two programs: a one-year course leading to an assistant's certificate and a two-year course leading to a director's certificate. The attendance requirement for the latter certificate was reduced to one year if the candidate was a holder of an assistant's certificate and had two years of successful teaching experience in a kindergarten school. A year's attendance for the director's certificate was also waived for holders of teachers' certificates, with one year of successful experience. In 1887 twenty-eight candidates graduated as directors and thirty-four as assistants.[42] Also by 1887 there were kindergarten schools in London, Berlin (now known as Kitchener), Waterloo, St. Catharines, Hamilton, Parkdale, Toronto, Cobourg, Kingston and Ottawa, with a total pupil attendance of 1,661 and a teacher staff of 74.[43] Eleven years later these figures rose to 105 kindergarten schools in operation, a pupil attendance of 10,693, and a teacher staff of 233.[44]

7. The Creation of District Model Schools

The specific purpose for the establishment of district model schools was to provide more trained teachers for the schools in the northern

part of the province. The Department had found it difficult to attract teachers from the more settled parts of the province to move to the remote, sparsely populated regions of the north. Thus, in 1896, under Regulation 64, the Minister of Education was empowered to select two public schools in each of the districts of Thunder Bay, Algoma, Parry Sound, and Nipissing as model schools.[45] In order to qualify for this status, a school was required to have a teaching staff of at least three teachers, with the principal holding a First Class Certificate and one of his assistants holding a Second Class Certificate. The professional training course was based on that given in the county model schools and led to a District (Third Class) Certificate.

These schools became part of the provincial model school scheme introduced in 1908.[46] Under this scheme the County Boards of Examiners were abolished and their powers were transferred to the Minister of Education. Graduates received Limited Third Class certificates (corresponding to District certificates) valid for five years. Like the district model schools, these schools were designed to provide teachers for districts and counties that could not, for financial and/or geographical reasons, obtain First and Second Class teachers. In 1912 there were fifteen such schools. By 1926, Second Class teachers had become sufficiently numerous to supply the need almost everywhere in the province, and so the schools were discontinued.

8. Other Important Changes and Developments: 1877-1927

Very few changes of major importance were made in the training and certification process of public school teachers between 1877 and the

beginning of the twentieth century. In 1880, the Department assumed the responsibility, previously held by the County Boards of Examiners, for reading the non-professional examination papers for Third Class certificates. This was followed in 1912 by the making of the Third Class Certificate valid throughout the province. In 1896, in an effort to encourage holders of a Third Class Certificate, especially those with junior standing, to proceed to normal schools to obtain a Second Class Certificate, the Department instructed the County Boards of Examiners to exercise restraint in the issuing of renewals.[47] In cases where renewal was granted, the certificate was no longer valid outside the county. As a result of this regulation, the Department was able to state in the Annual Report of 1898 that the "number of applicants for admission to the Normal Schools is greater than can at present be accommodated".[48]

In 1885, the course leading to the First Class Certificate was transferred to the newly organized training institutes for the preparation of high school teachers. The normal schools at Toronto and Ottawa were left with the course for the Second Class Certificate. After 1885, as previously noted, the normal schools at Ottawa and Toronto also assumed the responsibility for the preparation of kindergarten teachers.[49] The program for the First Class Certificate continued to be conducted by the various schools established in the following years for the preparation of high school teachers: the School of Pedagogy in 1890, the Ontario Normal College in 1897, and the faculties of education in Toronto and Queen's universities in 1907. In 1920, these faculties were closed and the Ontario College of Education was created for the primary purpose

of training secondary school teachers. At the same time, the course for the First Class Certificate was reinstated in the normal schools whose number had by 1920 increased to four. The schools also retained a program for the Second Class Certificate until 1936 when it was discontinued except in the University of Ottawa Normal School.

As the nineteenth century came to an end, a third normal school was established at London. By the late 1890's, the normal schools at Toronto and Ottawa could not accommodate all the applications for admission to the course for the Second Class Certificate. Indeed, during these years up to four to five hundred applicants per session were refused admission. Thus, in 1900, the London Normal School opened its doors for the first time with a teaching staff of six, including the principal. During the 1900-1901 session it admitted a total of 296 students. The additional school, however, did not seem to suffice. By 1909, four other normal schools were formed, at Hamilton, Peterborough, Stratford, and North Bay. The North Bay Normal School included a model school for the preparation of third-class teachers.

By the early 1920's, Ontario's system of elementary school teacher training had achieved a marked degree of expansion, organization, and consolidation. There were now seven normal schools which were training for both First and Second Class certificates. During the 1922-23 session, the schools registered an attendance of 1,815 students, the highest ever. The provincial model schools continued to train candidates for Third Class certificates and to provide summer courses for those with low qualifications who wished to improve themselves. A program of summer courses was also available for teachers wishing to obtain

specialized training in a particular subject. This form of in-service training continued in the following years to develop significantly, only to be interrupted in the 1930's by the Great Depression. By 1920, the kindergarten course was integrated with elementary teacher training into a program leading to a Kindergarten-Primary Certificate. At this time, elementary school teachers could qualify for this certificate by successfully completing two summer courses.

To meet the needs of English-French schools, several model schools for the training of bilingual teachers were established, one at Ottawa in 1907, a second at Sturgeon Falls in 1910 and in later years at Vankleek Hill, Sandwich, and Embrun. Graduates from the schools received Third Class certificates valid for three years. By the late 1920's the Department, recognizing the need for superior preparation of bilingual teachers, established the University of Ottawa Normal School (1927). As the University of Ottawa Normal School began to meet the demand for bilingual teachers, by 1935 the model schools had been phased out.

Teachers' institutes were still contributing to the in-service education of teachers through their annual meetings which received representational support from the normal schools' staffs. Lastly, there was O.C.E. which continued to provide, as the faculties of education at Toronto and Queen's universities had done earlier for both elementary and secondary school teachers, the opportunity to do advanced studies in education. The general economic prosperity experienced by the province following the end of World War I permitted the government to provide the necessary financial resources to support and maintain the system.

9. The Introduction of Higher Standards: 1927-1939

During the 1920's, there was a significant increase in both elementary and secondary school enrolments. This factor, coupled with a modification in the high school course, caused corresponding increases in normal school enrolments. Thus, by the late 1920's there was, except for the bilingual schools, a surplus of teachers holding Second Class certificates. There was also a rapid increase in the proportion of teachers with First Class certificates. Teachers, in general, were becoming more concerned about their professional development and were making effective use of the means of in-service education that the system provided. The atmosphere seemed right for the introduction of higher standards in teacher education.

Thus in 1927 the regulations were modified to require the completion of a two-year course of professional training in order to obtain a Permanent Public School Certificate (viz., a permanent First Class, Second Class, or Kindergarten certificate).[50] Under these regulations, candidates would receive interim certificates, valid for four years, at the end of a one-year course at a normal school. It was expected that these teachers might return to complete their second year after two years' successful teaching experience. After four years in service, it was mandatory for them to complete the second year if they wished to remain in the profession. Second-year courses were conducted at the Toronto Normal School for three years and at the Stratford Normal School for two years. A combination of factors, including lack of preparation and indecision, caused in 1932, the postponement of compulsory attendance

at this course. The following year (1932-33 session) the second-year course was offered and a total of 763 students were admitted. The course signified a definite improvement in teacher education standards. But it also represented, for the time, a financial sacrifice to teachers and a burden to the overloaded normal schools and staffs. The apparent lack of proper recognition accorded the certificate issued after the second year's course caused much dissatisfaction among the teachers. Thus, with the election of a new government in 1934 and the appointment of a new Minister of Education, Dr. J.L. Simpson, the course was dropped. At the same time that he discontinued the program, Simpson announced his intention of introducing other measures by which to check and reduce the over-supply of teachers and simultaneously raise the standards.[51]

Among the more important steps to reduce the supply of teachers implemented in 1935 were: courses leading to Second Class certificates were discontinued, except at the University of Ottawa Normal School; candidates for the Kindergarten-Primary Certificate were now required to have first class standing and qualifications in music; and candidates for the First Class Certificate were required to have standing in eight lower school and eight middle school subjects, as well as upper school standing.

In order to raise the standards of teacher education, a new scheme for permanent certification was introduced in 1935.[52] Under the new plan, a candidate for a permanent First Class Certificate would be required to do the equivalent of one year's university work, plus one summer session of professional training. Teachers in service wishing to obtain a permanent Second Class Certificate would be required to have

upper school standing and two Departmental special certificates in approved elementary school subjects. After 1934, all interim certificates were valid for four years and could be made permanent after three years of successful teaching experience. In 1939, the requirement for permanent certification was dropped to two years.

However, as war approached and teacher shortages developed, other changes were made that reversed the trend towards higher standards. Due to the post-war "baby boom", teacher shortages would continue right into the 1950's and early 1960's, at which time new plans would be introduced in order to improve the quality of elementary teacher education.

10. War-Time Emergency Measures

By the early 1940's, the teacher surplus of the late 1930's had already been quickly absorbed into the system. The ensuing teacher shortage caused by the war, unabated by the high requirements introduced in 1935, forced the Department to implement during the 1940's a series of emergency measures designed to attract more candidates to teaching and to maintain a high rate of retention in the profession.

Commencing in 1940, applicants to normal schools were admitted with only eight upper school papers instead of the previously required nine. This was lowered to seven in 1943, and to five papers in 1944. However, candidates with only five papers were issued Deferred Interim First Class certificates until such time as they had completed the remaining papers.

When the shortage became more serious in 1944, the Department renewed the Second Class Certificate for which candidates could qualify through

a special summer school course taken over two years. Admission requirements included middle school standing in eight subjects. Candidates successfully completing the first six-week summer session received Deferred Interim Second Class certificates. Those attending the second six-week summer session the following year received Interim Second Class certificates. At the end of the first six-week summer session in 1949, a total of 572 graduates received deferred certificates. Of these graduates, 449 were awarded Interim Second Class certificates the following summer.

A similar summer school program was introduced in 1947 at Toronto and North Bay for candidates holding middle school standing and at least five months of teaching experience on letters of permission. The course consisted also of two six-week summer sessions leading at the end of the second session to an Interim Second Class Certificate.

Then, in 1949, the admission requirements for the First Class Certificate were lowered to standing in five Grade 13 subjects, including one English paper, without any additional condition as had accompanied the 1944 regulations.

In addition to the above major steps, the Department also implemented other palliative measures in order to ameliorate the teacher supply. Indefinite extensions were granted to teachers with lapsed interim certificates; letters of permission were issued to teachers with lapsed Third Class certificates and to persons with only middle school standing and no training whatsoever; and teachers could substitute years of service for special certificates.[52]

The war-time measures were a setback to the trend for higher standards that was generated during the 1930's. Post-war attempts were made to revive this trend. However, the growing school population of the 1950's would further retard this development.

B. The Training of Secondary School Teachers

1. Training and Certification Requirements During Ryerson's Superintendency

During the early part of the nineteenth century, the prevailing opinion was that a university degree was enough to qualify an individual to teach any grade at elementary or secondary school level. Professional training was regarded as an imposition on university graduates rather than a necessary preparation for the special task of teaching. Thus, most grammar school teachers of this period had no professional training whatsoever. Ryerson did not, however, share this opinion. In 1847, he made provision for graduates of the newly established Toronto Normal School who held First Class certificates to teach in the grammar schools. He realized that the Normal School course was not sufficient to prepare them for advanced instruction. For this reason, in 1853 he urged the establishment of a model grammar school for the training of grammar school masters. Due to lack of funding, the school was not established until 1858. However, because he could not staff the school with appropriate instructors, that is, individuals who were versed in the science and philosophy of education and experienced in the application of scientific pedagogical principles, Ryerson was forced to close it in 1863.

In addition, during this period definite certification requirements were set down for grammar school masters. Under the Act of 1853, headmasters were exempted from having to undergo a test, but non-graduates were required to submit to a test administered by an examination committee consisting of the headmaster of the Normal School, the principal

of Upper Canada College, and the second master of the Normal School.[53] The subjects of the examination were those required of candidates for honours and scholarships at matriculation at the University of Toronto. The same basic requirements were reiterated in 1858.[54] In 1861, this examination was made a prerequisite for non-graduates seeking admission to the model grammar school, while graduates were exempted.[55]

Demands for closer control over the certification requirements of grammar school staff by the Department did not go completely unheeded in the ensuing years, despite the slow progress made in the development of any effective teacher training program. After 1865, all new headmasters of grammar schools were required to have a degree in Arts from a British university.[56] In 1872, it was made mandatory that all grammar schools have at least two teachers and that the assistant hold a common school teacher's certificate or else be an undergraduate of good standing.[57]

2. Changes Made Under Crooks' Ministry

In 1878, the certification requirements for the headmaster (principal) were slightly changed. In addition to the Arts degree, a candidate was required to have either one year's experience as a high school assistant or hold a First Class or Second Class Certificate.[58] In 1879, high school assistants were required to have either a degree in Arts from a British university or a First or Second Class Certificate.[59] Candidates who did not possess the latter two qualifications could still find their way into the high school by means of a special certificate issued by high school inspectors. In order to obtain these certificates,

they were required to sit for an examination. The certificates were valid for one year and could be renewed for a second year. However, they could not be renewed for a third year without a re-examination.

No other serious attempt at providing pre-service training for secondary school teachers was made for the next twenty years and more. In 1882, Adam Crooks introduced a course of lectures at the Department of Education for high school masters and First Class public school teachers. However, due to strong opposition, he was forced to drop them. At this time, Crooks was also intending to form a School of Pedagogy in connection with the Toronto Normal School for the training of secondary school teachers. This was not to be realized on account of his imminent death.

3. The Formation of Training Institutes

George W. Ross, Crooks' successor as Minister of Education, was also concerned about the lack of any training course for the preparation of high school masters. In the Act of 1885, Ross made provision for the selection of five collegiate institutes in the province as training institutes for high school assistants and First Class public school teachers. Initially four were formed, at Hamilton, Kingston, Guelph, and Strathroy. In 1888, a fifth institute was formed at Owen Sound. These institutes offered a fourteen-week course consisting of two weeks of instruction by the school principal in general theory and in the organization, classification, and management of a high school; six weeks of observation and tutoring by the department heads in special

methods and in the use of texts; and six weeks in observation and practice teaching. For five years, these institutes were the sole means of teacher preparation for secondary school teachers. However, they were still not adequate. Like the grammar model school, they failed to provide to the teachers-in-training any grounding in the science of education. Furthermore, many of the instructors themselves were ill-equipped to conduct such a professional training course.

4. The Development of the Ontario Normal College

In 1890, the training institutes were discontinued. The same year a School of Pedagogy was instituted in connection with the Toronto Normal School. The School offered a course similar to that of the normal school, but on a more advanced level, consisting of lectures in the History of Education, Psychology, School Organization and Management, Science Education, and the best pedagogical methods for the teaching of high school subjects. However, there was difficulty in securing the necessary facilities in the local collegiate institutes for observation and practice teaching. This caused, in 1893, the deletion of observation and practice teaching from the course. New candidates who had successfully completed a four months' course in theory were issued certificates valid for six months. During this period, they could teach and, if they passed a practical examination at the end of this time, they were granted permanent certificates. This plan was found quite unsatisfactory. In 1897, the School was moved to Hamilton where it became known as the Ontario Normal College. The College shared accommodation and personnel of the new collegiate institute. The principal of the college was also the

principal of the institute and the collegiate department heads constituted the college faculty. Most importantly, this new arrangement provided ample opportunity for the development of a more extensive program of observation and practice teaching. "In the Normal College," wrote its Principal, Dr. J.A. MacLellan, in his report of 1901, "are combined the benefits of the training institutes as schools for observation and practice, and of the School of Pedagogy as dealing with the Psychology, Science, Philosophy and Art of Education."[60]

The Ontario Normal College offered the first complete and comprehensive program for the training of secondary school teachers in Ontario. A session at the College lasted from the first of October to the end of May. Candidates seeking admission had to possess senior leaving standing or a degree in Arts from a British university, and be at least eighteen years of age before the closing date of the College. All College graduates received interim teaching certificates, which might be made permanent after two years of successful teaching experience. Holders of these certificates who were over twenty-one years of age were entitled to teach in high schools, while those who had not yet reached this age could teach only in the public schools. The College also conducted courses leading to Specialist's certificates, for which a demand was generated by the formation of collegiate institutes in 1885.

Despite the apparent success of the Ontario Normal College in the preparation of high school and First-Class public school teachers, it was closed down at the end of the 1906 session. Its functions were transferred to faculties of education that had been created for this

purpose, respectively at the University of Toronto and at Queen's University. In addition, these faculties also offered programs leading to the certificate of Public or Separate School Inspector and to the degrees of Bachelor and Doctor of Paedagogy.

5. The Establishment of the Ontario College of Education

In 1920, the faculties of education at Toronto and Queen's universities were both officially discontinued. In actuality, only the Faculty of Education at Queen's was terminated. The Faculty of Education at the University of Toronto was converted into the new Ontario College of Education, which from then on until the middle 60's would be the only educational institution in the province authorized to conduct the training of secondary school teachers. The training of candidates for First Class certificates was transferred to the normal schools in Hamilton, London, Ottawa, and Toronto. The object of this major change was to provide a training centre which would be able to exert all its efforts exclusively for the preparation of secondary school teachers. R.H. Grant, then Minister of Education, also intended that the new College develop special courses and programs to enable educators of the province to improve their standing and undertake advanced studies in education. Even though the College's main functions did not include any provision related to the training of public school teachers, because of the continued demand, it would go on to provide its graduates with the opportunity of obtaining dual certification, qualifying them to teach at all levels of the system. And so on June 30, 1920, the Ontario College of Education (O.C.E.) became a reality with the signing of a memorandum of agreement between the Minister of Education and the University of Toronto.

C. The Preparation of Vocational Teachers

A stimulus to the development of technical education in the province was given by the Industrial Education Act of 1911. The Act incorporated the recommendations made by Dr. John Seath, then Superintendent of Education, in his report on "Education for Industrial Purposes".[61] In his report, Dr. Seath also included recommendations relating to the establishment of appropriate facilities and courses for the training of teachers who were to teach technical subjects in the schools.[62]

In 1916, evening classes were organized for the training of vocational teachers in Toronto, Hamilton, and London. In 1921, these evening courses were supplemented by summer school in the Central Technical School at Toronto to accommodate specifically teachers from throughout the province who did not have easy access to the evening courses. The session ran from July 4th to August 5th. The summer school was also open to prospective vocational teachers and to teachers holding certificates in domestic science who wished to take the practical course in dressmaking. In order to obtain an Interim Ordinary Vocational Certificate, candidates were required to complete successfully two summer-school sessions.

The Industrial Education Act of 1911 provided only for vocational education in industrial and technical subjects. Later amendments to this Act were to expand its scope to include provision for instruction in commerical and agricultural subjects as well. These changes were integrated into a more comprehensive plan for the development of vocational education in the Vocational Education Act of 1921. This Act repealed the Industrial Education Act of 1911 and provided for the establishment and development of vocational schools, giving instruction in industrial,

home-making, art, technical, commercial and agricultural subjects.

The new Act meant a greater demand for properly trained teachers. F.W. Merchant, then Director of Industrial and Technical Education, realized that the evening and summer courses were inadequate to meet the needs resulting from the projected expansion.[63] Either a special department was to be added to one of the existing teacher training schools, Merchant maintained in 1921, or an independent college be established.[64] Merchant had hoped that the Federal Government would co-operate with the province in the establishment of a Dominion College. However, negotiations in this regard had not produced any positive results. In 1924, the Department decided to establish its own college for the training of vocational teachers. The new teacher training institution was to be located in Hamilton and known as the Ontario Training College for Technical Teachers. The College began its first term on April 20th, 1925. The founding of the College marked, in the words of its first Principal, F.P. Gavin, "the carrying out of the last of the important recommendations made by Dr. Seath in 1911".[65]

The expressed purpose of the new College was "to train teachers of shop or vocational subjects for technical schools, and manual training teachers for public and high schools".[66] Initially, the duration of the course was fixed at twenty weeks, ten of which could be taken either in the autumn or spring term, and ten of which could be taken in two five-week summer sessions. The autumn and spring sessions consisted of observation and practice teaching and the summer courses consisted primarily of theory, trade analysis, and the preparation of courses of study.

In subsequent years the College would offer other related courses. In 1930, the College established a course leading to a Vocational Guidance Certificate, and in 1934, a course leading to a Vocational School Principal's Certificate. In 1932, it began conducting winter and summer courses for prospective teachers, and in 1934 it offered a general education course for skilled craftsmen who had not completed high school and who now aspired to become shop instructors.

The College was closed in 1933 for one year as an economic measure. It was reopened in 1934 and continued in operation until 1941, when because of war conditions, was once again closed. It was reopened in 1945 and the following year all its functions were transferred to Toronto, where they were reorganized into a department of the Ontario College of Education.

D. Summation

By 1950, Ontario had a well-structured, highly centralized, and comprehensive system of teacher education. Despite its humble beginnings, slow development, and recurrent setbacks, the system had achieved a degree of consolidation of both physical and human recources to meet adequately, in a somewhat utilitarian manner, the essential needs of the schools. The Ontario College of Education had the exclusive responsibility of training both secondary and vocational school teachers. In addition, it provided teachers with the opportunity of doing advanced studies in education or of upgrading their qualifications through its in-service courses. Post-graduate studies in education were also conducted at this time at the University of Ottawa. There were seven normal schools for the preparation and in-service education of elementary school teachers.

However, progress in the raising of standards was slow, especially those of elementary school teachers. Since the establishment of O.C.E., admission to the secondary school certificate course was restricted to candidates holding acceptable university degrees. In 1903, the normal school program was extended to one year. No other attempt to increase standards of elementary school teachers was made until the late 1920's and early 1930's. These efforts were dampened by the Great Depression and interrupted by World War II. Indeed, war-time expendients had a reverse effect on the quality of teacher education. Progress in this regard was delayed by the post-war teacher shortage which continued well into the 1950's. Nevertheless, higher standards, quality teacher education, would constitute, more than ever before, a primary concern of

educators in the 1950's, beginning with the members of the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario, which was appointed in 1945. However, the seemingly utilitarian and politically conservative approach to the crisis taken by the Department would override this concern, and no major reforms would be made until the early 1960's.

Notes

1. Robert A. Stevens, The Path We Came By, Great Britain: printed by the Stellar Press Hatfield Herts, 1973, pp. 68-76.

2. J. George Hodgins, ed., Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada (Ontario) 1791-1876, Toronto: Warwick & Rutter, 1894-1910, Vol. 3, p. 137. (Hereafter, this work will be noted by its abbreviation D.H.E.)

3. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 347.

4. Ibid., p. 303.

5. Ibid., Vol. 4, pp. 260-261.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid., p. 261.

9. Egerton Ryerson, Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada, Montreal: Lovell and Gibson, 1847, p. 156.

10. Ibid.

11. J. George Hodgins, ed., op. cit., Vol. 9, p. 217.

12. Egerton Ryerson, op. cit., p. 160.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid., p. 162.

17. J. George Hodgins, ed., op. cit., Vol. 6, p. 60.

18. J. George Hodgins, ed., Ryerson Memorial Volume, Toronto: Warwick & Sons, 1889, p. 89.

19. J. George Hodgins, ed., D.H.E., Vol. 7, p.172.

20. Ibid., Vol. 9, p. 42.

21. Ibid., p. 190.

22. Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 249.

23. Ibid.

24. Ibid., Vol. 22, p. 64.

25. Ibid., Vol. 23, p. 72.

26. Ibid., p. 75.

27. Ibid., p. 76.

28. Ibid., p. 131.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 22.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., Vol. 28, p. 110.

33. Ibid.

34. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1877, p. 132.

35. Ibid.

36. Ibid., p. 108.

37. J. G. Althouse, The Ontario Teacher 1800-1910, Toronto: W.J. Gage Ltd., 1967, (D.Paed. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1929), pp. 62-63.

38. Ontario. Department of Education, op. cit., p. 109.

39. Ibid., p. 111.

40. Ibid.

41. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1882, p. 234.

42. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1887, p. xxvi.

43. Ibid.

44. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1898, p. xl.

45. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1896, p. 87.

46. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1908, p. 333.

47. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1898, pp. 77-78.

48. Ibid., p. 78.

49. See p. 28.

50. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1927, p. 27.

51. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1935, p. 2.

52. Ervin E. Newcombe, "The Development of the Elementary School Teacher in Ontario Since 1900," Ed.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1965, pp. 136-137.

53. J. George Hodgins, D.H.E., Vol. 14, p. 67.

54. Ibid.

55. Ibid., Vol. 17, p. 9.

56. Ibid., Vol. 19, p. 26.

57. Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 179.

58. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1878, pp. 58-59.

59. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1879, p. 179.

60. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1901, p. 187.

61. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1916, p. 52.

62. Ibid.

63. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1921, p. 26.

64. Ibid.

65. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1925, p. 279.

66. Ibid., p. 281.

Part III

POST-WAR READJUSTMENT AND GROWTH: 1950-1965

A. Background

The 1950's and early 1960's represent an era of rapid growth and economic prosperity for Ontario. A doubling in the birth rate, an unusually high increase in the immigrant population, accelerated industrial productivity, rapid urban growth, a greater recognition of the value of education and a reaffirmation of every individual's right to education combined to provide the necessary pre-conditions for all the educational developments of the period and especially those that occurred in teacher education.

The marked increase in the school population created by the interplay of these conditions caused greater effort to be exerted in providing the new material and human resources required by the expanding educational system that less attention was paid to the demands being made calling for increased standards in teacher education. (see Tables 1 and 2) Hence, the resulting teacher shortage, further escalated by high attrition rate experienced between 1946 and 1956, was met with a continuation of many emergency measures similar to those introduced during the war. Although some educators did not see the situation as being critical but as a concomitant effect of rapid development and expansion, a state of emergency continued until the mid 1960's when the teacher supply began improving.

Some of the emergency measures introduced during this period included the lowering of qualifications for the first class certificate, the revival of second class certificates and the lowering of entrance requirements for the two-year course. The measures were vehemently

TABLE 1

SEPTEMBER SCHOOL ENROLMENT, ONTARIO, 1944-1966
(Actual to 1952, estimated 1953 to 1966)

	Year	September Elementary School Enrolment	Increase Elementary	September Secondary School Enrolment	Increase Secondary
↓ ACTUAL →	1944	528,846	—	111,488	—
	1945	525,298	—3,548	117,602	6,114
	1946	542,260	16,962	123,862	6,260
	1947	552,478	10,218	122,683	—1,179
	1948	579,252	26,774	124,068	1,385
	1949	598,973	19,721	127,068	3,000
	1950	622,755	23,782	130,936	3,868
	1951	661,430	38,675	133,081	2,145
↓	1952	707,215	45,785	140,855	7,774
↓ ESTIMATED →	1953	749,200	42,000	144,900	4,000
	1954	792,200	43,000	149,400	4,500
	1955	836,200	44,000	154,400	5,000
	1956	881,200	45,000	159,900	5,500
	1957	924,200	43,000	166,400	6,500
	1958	963,200	39,000	173,900	7,500
	1959	997,200	34,000	182,900	9,000
	1960	1,028,200	31,000	192,900	10,000
	1961	1,055,200	27,000	202,900	10,000
	1962	1,077,200	22,000	211,900	9,000
	1963	1,095,200	18,000	220,900	9,000
	1964	1,107,200	12,000	229,400	8,500
	1965	1,117,200	10,000	237,400	8,000
	1966	1,124,200	7,000	244,900	7,500
	Total Increase 1952 to 1966		417,000		104,000
	Additional Teachers Required by 1966		13,590		4,430

Source: R.W.B. Jackson and F.S. Rivers, "Teacher Supply in Canada," in Canadian Education, Vol. VIII, No. 3(June, 1953), p. 17.

TABLE 2*

Enrolment in elementary and secondary schools of Ontario, 1945–70

YEAR	ELEMENTARY[a]			SECONDARY[b]	ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
	Public	Roman Catholic separate	TOTAL[a]		
1945–6	436,709	108,298	545,007	119,773	664,780
1946–7	441,333	108,877	539,012	123,846	662,858
1947–8	453,116	111,413	550,035	123,085	673,120
1948–9	469,517	115,507	571,459	125,234	696,693
1949–50	493,532	122,687	592,726	127,250	719,976
1950–1	508,364	127,253	612,182	131,215	743,397
1951–2	544,483	134,177	654,506	133,556	788,062
1952–3	588,344	146,668	712,892	141,091	853,983
1953–4	620,446	162,738	768,397	148,744	917,141
1954–5	643,951	174,208	821,736	160,166	981,902
1955–6	676,246	187,368	863,614	174,562	1,038,176
1956–7	706,319	205,577	911,896	185,605	1,097,501
1957–8	747,236	223,881	971,117	203,525	1,174,642
1958–9	784,167	243,431	1,027,598	222,075	1,249,673
1959–60	817,880	263,769	1,081,649	237,576	1,319,225
1960–1	843,737	282,651	1,126,388	262,775	1,389,163
1961–2	861,715	301,338	1,163,053	299,177	1,462,230
1962–3	880,198	316,831	1,197,029	331,578	1,528,607
1963–4	901,830	331,334	1,233,164	364,210	1,597,374
1964–5	925,068	353,405	1,278,473	395,301	1,673,774
1965–6	949,374	370,669	1,320,043	418,738	1,738,781
1966–7	976,900	387,971	1,364,871	436,026	1,800,897
1967–8	1,002,555	402,497	1,405,052	463,736	1,868,788
1968–9	1,021,676	408,914	1,430,590	500,807	1,931,397
1969–70	1,042,561	413,556	1,456,117	530,679	1,986,796

SOURCE: Reports of the Minister of Education of Ontario.

* W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. I: The Expansion of the Educational System, p. 95.

Comment:

A comparison can be made, if only for historical interest, between the estimated figures on school enrolments compiled by R.W.B. Jackson and F.S. Rivers back in 1953 and the actual enrolment figures recorded by W.G. Fleming in 1971. The estimates on elementary school enrolments do not deviate greatly from the actual figures. On the other hand, the estimates on secondary school enrolments begin to differ by a substantial margin in 1955-56 and for the remaining projected years. The significant rise in immigration during these years and later the reorganized secondary school program of 1962-63 can, at least in part, account for this difference.

[a]Including grades 9 and 10 in separate schools, and auxiliary.
[b]Including non-graded students.

opposed by the teachers' organizations which, while acknowledging their short-term efficacy, saw them as having a negative effect on the quality of not only the teacher education courses but also on teaching in the schools. Instead, they argued that emphasis must be placed on higher standards, longer teacher education courses conducted in conjunction with the universities, the improvement of all teachers in the system through in-service education, and the achievement of better salary scales not only as an incentive for teachers already in service but also for prospective candidates.

This call for internal reform and amelioration of working conditions by the teachers' associations was supported by others in educational circles including Ontario's Royal Commission on Education in its report (The Hope Report). However, many of the proposals made during this period would not find immediate fruition but would have to await the advent of more favourable conditions heralded by the MacLeod Report (1966), the report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers. But, putting aside the unique socio-economic conditions of the era, one cannot help but view the outcries for the improvement of teacher education as echoing a judgment of teachers and teacher education which has been perennially made by either teachers themselves or by the public ever since the beginning of public schooling in Ontario. Despite the fact that now their professional status was guaranteed under law by the Professional Teachers Act of 1944, the teachers, reflecting a seemingly undying sense of insecurity, rallied to oppose the emergency measures taken by the Department for they saw them as being detrimental to the development of their profession.

Unmoved by the presentations made by the various professional organizations and motivated more by the startling realities of a rising school population and teacher shortage, W.J. Dunlop, then Ontario Minister of Education, did not hesitate to introduce the necessary emergency measures, thus placing teacher education in a situation far below the ideal. Moreover, even though Dunlop himself did not seem to have considered the teacher shortage as serious as others, he continued to remain unaffected by the reactions of others to his policy since he knew that given the circumstances that prevailed there seemed to be no other more viable alternate solutions to the shortage.

Notwithstanding the critical nature of the situation, a view not shared by all, a retrospective and reflective examination of the numerous expedients introduced during the fifteen-year span discloses what appears to be the failure on the part of the system to be able to integrate in its policy-making process qualitative as well as innovative changes with pragmatic and short-term arrangements. This in turn points to the more fundamental weakness in the system -- its resistance to outside influences and its undue reliance on conservative strategy.

B. Key Documents

1. The Hope Report

Five and a half years after first receiving its mandate to enquire into the provincial education system by an Order-in-Council dated March 21st, 1945, the Royal Commission on Education in Ontario (chaired by Justice John Andrew Hope) finally released its 933-page report on December 15, 1950. In his treatment of the Hope Report in his doctoral dissertation, Carlyn Goulson comments that this painstaking, extremely drawn-out inquiry "discouraged further educational investigation for at least a decade".[1] Unquestionably the Commission had overstayed its welcome in the public's mind so that its findings and recommendations did not have an immediate impact on the educational scene. In the field of teacher education, the implementation of some of its more innovative recommendations was hampered by the state of emergency that existed and to which the Commission had addressed itself in its Interim Report, "An Emergency Training Scheme for Teachers for the Public and Separate Schools of Ontario", which was submitted to the Minister of Education on December 2nd, 1949.[2] Nevertheless, these recommendations, revolving mainly around the improvement of standards in teacher education, would be taken up by others, expanded upon and refined and finally incorporated, at least in part, in the succinct and highly influential report by the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, chaired by C.R. MacLeod.

After a careful study of forecast estimates showing startling increases in enrolment in elementary schools covering the period from

1950-51 to 1957-58 inclusively, the Commission was precipitated into making an early submission to the Minister in the form of an Interim Report. In proposing certain emergency measures, the Commissioners were quick to point out that the lowering of qualifications for admission to the teaching profession should be viewed purely as short-term steps designed to counteract a very serious situation and that any lowering of standards was contrary to their "convictions".[3] In response to the imminent crisis, the Commission proposed an "Emergency Teacher Training Scheme" which would consist basically of a subsidized one-year course in place of the two-summer school certificate programs initiated in 1949.[4] Candidates who possessed Grade 12 standing or the equivalent educational achievement or experience in other fields were eligible for this course. In conjunction with this program, the Commissioners also recommended the establishment of selection committees, to be appointed by the Minister, for the purpose of interviewing and evaluating prospective candidates. All those who successfully completed this one-year course would be awarded either a First or Second Class Certificate (depending upon their standing prior to admission) which could be made permanent after two years of service.

While stress was placed in the Interim Report on the urgency of procuring the human resources required to meet adequately the demands made by the increasing enrolment, it is evident that the Commissioners were also quite aware at this point that concomitantly this would mean that provision would have to be made for the material facilities to accommodate the expanding system, including the development of more

teacher training institutions. Indeed, in their final report they proposed the establishment of new junior colleges of education to replace the existing normal schools and to equip them with the most modern facilities.[5] Their proposals certainly indicate that they had a good grasp of the situation, an understanding nurtured substantially by the compelling statistical estimates and forecasts which made it quite clear that significant readjustments and provisions would have to be made by all concerned.

The "Emergency Teacher Training Scheme" did not receive the enthusiastic support that was expected by the Commissioners. The only proposal upon which the Department took immediate action was that referring to the setting up of selection committees at each of the eight normal schools. These committees consisted of the principal, who acted as chairman, appointed members from the school and inspectoral staffs, and representatives from the Ontario Teachers' Federation. Members of these committees visited secondary schools in the province to interview Grade 13 students who had an expressed interest in becoming teachers. However, in 1950 no reduction in the entrance requirements was made. The selection committees would be continued the next year. It would not be until the 1952-53 school year that the Department would introduce its own emergency plan making some concessions to the scheme put forward by the Commissioners.

In addition to their short-term plan and in response to the many briefs they had received calling for improvement in the teacher education program, the Commissioners, in their final report, detailed a proposal

for the reorganization of the existing program. While urging that some degree of decentralization be achieved by delegating more "power", "responsibility" and "freedom" to the normal school principals, they reaffirmed at the very beginning of their proposal the final authority of the Minister of Education and stressed that control over certification, entrance requirements and related matters should be centralized.[6] Their argument in support of this position was based on the principle that in any system of publicly supported schools the final authority and responsibility "must lie with a central authority", which is, in this case, the elected representatives of the people and, in particular, those elected representatives who constitute in any given session of the Legislature the executive of government.[7] Within this framework, all other forms of civil authority are a delegation of this supreme one. Hence, the Commissioners spoke of the authority of the Minister of Education to empower or to enter into agreement with the universities to provide courses or sets of courses for teacher education.[8] However, as future developments would show in the late sixties and early seventies, the application of this political principle was not such an easy matter, especially when dealing with other civil institutions that are equally as protective of their autonomy and freedom as government is of its own jurisdiction.

Their proposed plan for teacher education would be a follow-up on their reorganization of the grading system in the schools. They recommended that grades in the schools be divided into three levels: Grades 1-6 would constitute the elementary level; Grades 7-10 the

secondary level; and Grades 11-13 the junior college level. The last level would mean the establishment of junior colleges in replacement of the high schools. For the training of elementary school teachers, the Commission proposed the establishment of junior colleges of education to replace the existing normal schools.[9] These colleges would offer a two-year course during which the candidates would follow a general education and professional training curriculum. Prospective candidates for these junior colleges of education would be required to have a Junior College Graduation Diploma (the equivalent of Grade 13) in order to be eligible for admission and after successful completion of the two-year course they would receive an Interim Elementary School Teaching Certificate.

Under the proposed program, a one-year course would also be required of those candidates who wished to become certified teachers of general shop work on the secondary level and teachers of specialized shops at the junior level. Candidates taking the secondary route would require a Secondary School Teaching Certificate. Successful completion of the one-year course gave them an Interim General Shop Work Teaching Certificate. On the other hand, candidates wishing to obtain their Interim Vocational Teaching Certificate would have to hold a Junior College Graduation Diploma and possess journeyman experience in their special field.

The Commissioners also proposed alternate routes for teachers on the elementary and secondary levels who wished to obtain dual certification qualifying them to teach all grades from 1 to 10. A holder

of a Secondary School Teaching Certificate could qualify for an Interim Elementary School Teaching Certificate either by taking the elementary school option in the recommended one-year course for secondary school teachers (to be offered at O.C.E.) followed by a prescribed summer course and a final examination or by taking two summer courses and passing a final examination. The elementary school teacher could qualify for dual certification only after he had completed a university degree. At that point, he would only be required to take two summer courses and pass a final examination.

Lastly, the Commissioners recommended that the Interim Certificate awarded in the proposed reorganization could be made permanent after two years of successful experience as confirmed by the inspector or inspectors concerned.

The junior colleges of education were never created. The normal schools would go on training teachers for the elementary schools -- though they would assume the title of "college" with the Department's implementation of its own emergency plan in 1953. The Commission's voice of support for higher standards in teacher education would be re-echoed through the decade and its emergency proposal would be considered at least in part by the Department and strongly criticized by others.

2. The Bowers Report

On the 6th of June, 1950 the Ontario Normal School Teachers' Association appointed a special committee to inquire into all aspects of the education program of elementary school teachers. The committee, chaired by Dr. Henry Bowers, Principal of the Stratford Normal School,

completed its work within five months and on exactly the same day (December 15, 1950) as The Royal Commission on Education in Ontario submitted its report, the committee released its own A Report on the Normal Schools of the Province of Ontario. Like the Hope Commission, the Bowers Committee acknowledged the crisis situation that existed. However, in response to what appears to have been an intense dissatisfaction expressed at their public and self-image by the Association membership, the Committee urged Dr. Althouse, then Chief Director of Education and to whom the report was addressed, to increase the standards of teacher education. The Committee believed that "An announcement (by Dr. Althouse) to the profession and the public of a policy to raise the standards for admission and training as soon as possible would allay the prevalent feelings of alarm and apprehension concerning the future of elementary education in the province."[10]

The Committee recommended a longer period of training consisting, in accord with the Hope Commission, of a two-year course, emphasizing that the second year should be a "definite advance on the first".[11] However, in response to the emergency situation, the Committee suggested that during this period (projected to cover the years from 1952 to 1956) the normal schools should offer a one-year course leading to the First Class Certificate. For admission-requirements purposes, the Committee devised a five-year plan over which time the standards would be gradually raised. Beginning in 1952, candidates would be required to have Grade 13 standing in six papers including one in either English Literature or English Composition. Furthermore while in training,

candidates would have to maintain a standing above the 30th percentile mark and a pass in every paper and in practice teaching. By 1956 these standards would be significantly increased so that candidates would be required to have, prior to admission, a Grade 13 standing in nine papers, including papers in English Literature and Composition and while at normal school would only have to maintain a standing above the 15th percentile mark and a pass in every paper and in practice teaching. The Committee further recommended that during this five-year period, those candidates who obtained a pass in every paper and in their practice teaching but who ranked below the percentile mark required in a given year, be awarded Interim Second Class certificates.

The Committee was quite avant-garde in its perception of the need to recruit university graduates to elementary school teaching and in its endorsement of the view that the possession of a university degree would be a definite asset to the profession. For such candidates they prescribed a shorter training course:

> "The maturity and breath of experience of university graduates makes feasible a relatively short period of professional training. The Committee foresees a one-year training course for those students who possess a university degree, or its equivalent, parallel to the proposed two-year course for those who enter with Grade XIII standing."[12]

Reflecting the tone set in the Hope Commission, the Committee urged that greater co-operation should exist between the universities and the normal schools in teacher education. Towards this end, they recommended the affiliation, as opposed to outright integration,

as later recommended by the Minister's Committee, of the normal schools with the universities and the granting of credit for normal school work and departmental summer school courses towards a Bachelor's degree.[13] The Committee's spirit of reform along these lines is further illustrated by their miscellaneous suggestion recommending that the name "normal school" be dropped in referring to teacher training institutions and that a more suitable nomenclature be developed to reflect more accurately the reality teacher education had become.[14] The Department, as noted elsewhere, changed the name from normal schools to teachers' colleges in 1953.[15]

The Committee joined the Hope Commission in asserting that certification should remain under Department control and in recommending the conversion of an Interim First Class Certificate to a Permanent First Class Certificate with a minimum of two successful years of teaching experience. Furthermore, it recommended the elimination of the summer course and the continuation of the one-year course and the selection committees for three years on a trial basis. However, unlike the Hope Commission, which had recommended a reduction in the entrance requirements in its Interim Report, the Committee exhorted Dr. Althouse that no change whatsoever be made that would tend to undermine the quality of the teacher-education program.

3. The O.P.S.M.T.F. Proposal

Concern for the teacher shortage and the lowering of standards in teacher education implied in the Hope Commission's emergency scheme was also expressed by the teachers of the province through a short

report released by the Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation (O.P.S.M.T.F.). At its 1949 Easter Convention, the Federation appointed an eight-man Teachers' Qualifications Committee chaired initially by T.A.S. McKee, who was later succeeded by W.G. Loney. The task confronting the Committee was to seek ways by which to improve the state of teacher education of elementary school teachers. The Committee presented its final report to the Provincial Executive of O.P.S.M.T.F. in December, 1950, coincidentally the same month during which both the Hope Commission and the Bowers reports were released. The report received unanimous approval by the Provincial Executive and subsequently by the Board of Governors of the Ontario Teachers' Federation (O.T.F.) with the recommendation that the report be presented to the Department of Education.

The Committee argued strongly against the emergency plan proposed by the Hope Commission. Instead the Committee maintained that what was needed was a fully developed program designed to improve the prestige of the teaching profession and the qualifications of elementary school teachers. In turn, this meant the setting up of highly refined and effective procedures of recruiting, selecting, and training teachers. The Committee believed that the existing recruitment practices had all been negative both in themselves and in their effects on the teaching profession. It contended that the Department of Education's policy in regard to these matters was dictated solely by the principle of supply and demand. The result was that the Department never attempted to develop any positive program by which to attract high-quality candidates to the profession. Indeed, its policy had exactly the opposite

effect. The Committee commented:

> "It would appear that this 'cheapening of the profession' has kept out the more capable and ambitious young people who might otherwise have been interested in becoming teachers, and is, in ever-increasing measure, filling the professional ranks with persons of mediocre ability, who have been attracted by the ease with which they have been able to secure admission to the training schools."[16]

Furthermore, the Committee pointed out that coupled with a sound, positive program of recruitment what was also necessary if success were to be achieved was the elimination of the deterrent factors which tended to sway prospective candidates away from the profession, viz., low prestige of the profession, low salaries, high teacher-student ratios, poor working conditions, few opportunities for advancement and the many social restrictions under which the teacher had to exercise his role in the community.[17]

The Committee also decried the lack of a system of selection. While acknowledging the selection committees recommended by the Hope Commission, it observed that little use was made of personality and aptitude tests in the selection of teachers. In addressing themselves to this problem, the Committee members would put forward a recommendation similar to that proposed by the normal school teachers, namely, the establishment of selection or screening committees for the purpose of conducting an extensive and comprehensive evaluation of candidates.

Going a step further than both the Hope Commission and the Bowers Committee, the O.P.S.M.T.F. Committee objected to departmental control over the admission of individuals into the teaching profession. Previewing a later development, the Committee suggested that the control

be shared, in proposing a dual-control system.[18] This system would involve the transfer of teacher training from the normal schools to faculties of education. "This would be a system where an Ontario University (or all of them, if practical) would create a new department to be known as the Faculty of Education."[19] This kind of arrangement would require a considerable amount of co-operation between the Department of Education and the particular faculty and the Committee envisaged the Director of Professional Training (from the same Department) as co-ordinator of this new system.[20] The individual faculty of education would assume control of the academic side of the curriculum and the Department would retain control of the professional training part of the course. The cost of the course would be borne by both the Department and students. Furthermore, admission into the teaching profession would be achieved through a form of licensing similar to that practised in the other professions such as medicine, law, accounting, etc. Upon completing his course of studies and training at the university, the graduate would have to present himself before a "Licencing Board" before whom he would have to pass final tests and/or be interviewed.[21] The Board would be set up under the authority of the Department of Education and its membership would consist of representatives from the same Department, the faculties of education, the Ontario Teachers' Federation, the Public School Inspector' Association, the Separate School Inspectors' Association and the Ontario School Trustees Association. As was conceived by the Committee, the Board's power would extend over the issuance, suspension or cancellation of licenses.[22] The Committee members viewed this proposed change in the power structure

of teacher education with a deep sense of optimism. They envisioned several advantages accruing to the profession including the "improvement" and "stabilization" of teachers' qualifications and the provision of an integrated course of studies which would not only be enriching both personally and professionally, but would constitute a stepping stone for the individual to further development and amelioration by giving him access to post-graduate studies at the university.[23]

Teacher education at a faculty of education would consist of a concurrent course of study.[24] The Committee proposed a three-year course which would give the candidate sufficient time to mature personally and professionally through increased practice-teaching time, review of subject matter of elementary course, and exposure to a variety of academic subjects which he could credit to any other univsity program should the teaching course not appeal to him. Completion of the three-year course would give the individual nine credits which he could use towards the Arts Degree. (The proposal is quite reminiscent of that made to the Minister of Education fifteen years later by York University). In addition, the individual would also receive a Bachelor's degree in Education (B.Ed.), that in turn qualified him for licencing by the proposed Licensing Board.

In its proposal, the Committee also made provision for the in-service education of teachers to ensure that all would have the opportunity of obtaining a B.Ed. degree. Thus, the Committee recommended that holders of a B.A. degree already in the profession be granted the equivalent status as those having a B.Ed. degree and

the conversion of five successful years of experience over and above the first five to credit in one academic subject in the university course, to a maximum of three.

The Department took no immediate action on any of the major recommendations contained in the O.P.S.M.T.F. proposal. Only those suggestions, made also in the Hope and Bowers studies, dealing with recruitment and screening mechanisms were given any serious consideration. At best that kind of reaction was in all probability a token gesture politically intended to sooth and appease the wise commissioners. Such grand efforts at reform would not be renewed until the early and middle sixties and would not be actualized in some form or another until the late sixties and early seventies, at a time when signs were beginning to appear that expansion had reached its ceiling potential and that further growth would be bought at very high premiums.

C. Teacher Education

1. Physical Facilities

As the 1950's begin, the Ontario College of Education continued to be the sole preparatory institution of secondary school teachers and teachers of vocational subjects -- a monopoly which would soon be terminated. University graduates of O.C.E. had also the advantage of being able to obtain dual certification by completing an additional summer school course. In addition, O.C.E. was, along with the Faculty of Psychology and Education of the University of Ottawa, the only institution offering postgraduate studies in education. Preparation

for elementary school teachers was conducted at the normal schools situated in several locations throughout the province: Hamilton, London, North Bay, Ottawa, Peterborough, Stratford, and Toronto. However, in a few years these schools would not only witness a change in their names and in some cases in their physical structure and locus, the establishment of more sister institutions, but the creation of closer ties with universities and thus a change in their mode of functioning.

Phase one in the new plan to reorganize teacher education in the early 1950's included the change in name from normal school to teachers' college in 1953, and a construction program made necessary by the rising enrolments in the latter institutions. However, the program would not affect all these institutions. Those fortunate enough to be considered by the Department included Hamilton Teachers' College and London Teachers' College, which received completely new facilities built on the respective campuses of McMaster University and the University of Western Ontario. The colleges in Ottawa, Peterborough, Stratford and North Bay were left to cope with the increase in enrolments with their antiquated structures most of which were built at the turn of the century.

To accommodate further the rising enrolments, John P. Robarts, Dunlop's successor as Minister of Education, embarked on the construction and establishment of brand new institutions. The first of these was Lakeshore Teachers' College in 1959. This was followed by the establishment of teachers' colleges at the Lakehead in 1960, Windsor in 1962, Sudbury in 1963, and St. Catharines in 1965. With the

exception of the colleges at Windsor and the Lakehead, all the new training facilities were constructed in close proximity to the local universities to facilitate their anticipated association in the field of teacher education.

As the early 1960's approached, so came the end of O.C.E.'s domination of secondary school teachers' preparation. On March 28, 1960, Robarts announced the establishment on an experimental basis of a summer course for the preparation of secondary school teachers to be conducted at London and Kingston. Its successful operation would be a clear indication to the Department of the suitability of selecting these two locations as future sites for the establishment of two new teachers' colleges. The experiment did prove to be a success, thus paving the way for the development of the colleges.

The first of these two colleges to be realized was Althouse College of Education at London, which was affiliated with the University of Western Ontario. An agreement defining the relation between the new college and the University was reached between William Davis, then Minister of Education, and University of Western Ontario officials on April 16, 1963. It began its first full-year of operation in September 1965, making temporary use of the facilities at London Teachers' College and the Ontario Vocational Centre until January 1966 when it moved to its new facilities close to the university campus.

The second new college came into being in 1965 and was named McArthur College in honour of Duncan McArthur, a former Minister of Education (1940-1943). The college was situated in Kingston and affiliated with Queen's University. An agreement between Davis and

Queen's University was reached in 1965, but it did not go into full operation until the Fall of 1968.

Because of the acute shortage of teachers both of these colleges developed quickly. They assumed the responsibility for summer emergency courses in their areas from O.C.E., a responsibility which they continued to carry out until 1972 by which time the increase in the number of places in the regular winter sessions, and a growing disenchantment with such a heavy reliance on emergency trained teachers, permitted the Ministry to discontinue the summer courses.

A final chapter in the story of O.C.E. during this period consisted of a change in its name to the College of Education, University of Toronto, coinciding with the signing of a new agreement between the college and the University of Toronto. The term "Ontario College" assumed a more generic denotation to refer to all the teachers' colleges of the province.

Finally, no review of the development of physical facilities would be complete without reference to the establishment of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (O.I.S.E.), which must certainly represent the apex of the construction program initiated and conducted during this period. The Institute was established by an act of the Legislature on June 22, 1965 and began operating immediately thereafter in July, 1965. Its development and relevance to teacher education will be considered elsewhere. Suffice it to note at this point that O.I.S.E. added a new dimension to the educational system in general and to teacher education in particular. It was intended to infuse a new vitality and new ideas into a system which knew no ceilings or

boundaries to its growth potential.

2. Admission and Certification Requirements in 1950 Of Elementary School Teachers

Admission and certification requirements in the early 1950's continued to reflect post-war standards established in the face of a growing demand for elementary school teachers. The basic criteria were the same as in Ryerson's days. A candidate had to be a British subject, of good character, and in good physical condition as corroborated by a medical examination. That the latter of the three criteria has always been given serious consideration by the Department is shown by the special section that was devoted to it until only recently in the Minister's annual report.

For admission to the one-year course leading to a First Class Certificate, a candidate was required to have a standing in five Grade 13 subjects, including one in English literature or English Composition, or a degree from a British university. At the University of Ottawa Normal School, in addition to the English requirement, a candidate had to have a second subject in either French Literature or French Composition.

In an effort to meet the recurring problem of teacher shortage in bilingual schools, the University of Ottawa Normal School also offered a one-year course leading to a Second Class Certificate. Admission requirements for this course included standing in Grades 11 and 12 English, special French, mathematics and social studies. This course continued to be offered at the Ottawa Teachers' College until 1966 when

it was transferred to the Sudbury Teachers' College. The same requirements (except special French for those coming from non-bilingual schools) plus five months of teaching experience obtained on a letter of permission were required of candidates for the special summer school courses offered in the other normal schools and leading to an Interim Second Class Certificate. The program consisted of two six-week summer sessions. At the end of the first session successful candidates received a Deferred Interim Second Class Certificate. Six months of successful teaching experience made them eligible for the second session leading to the Interim Certificate.

Access to the Interim First Class Certificate was also had through the dual certification program at O.C.E. Candidates in the one-year course leading to the Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B could qualify for the Interim First Class Certificate by taking an additional summer course. The two certificates qualified the individual to teach all grades from 1 to 13.

Applicants for the Primary School (Kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2) Specialist Certificate course offered at the Toronto Normal School were required to have either a Bachelor's degree or, at least, an Interim First Class Certificate. The duration of the course was one year and successful candidates were granted an Interim Primary School Specialist Certificate which was valid for five years and was made permanent after two years of teaching experience. In fact, all the interim elementary teachers' certificates were valid for five years and were made permanent after two years of successful teaching experience.

Of Secondary School Teachers

At this time, for an invididual wishing to pursue a teaching career in the secondary schools (Grades 9 to 13) of the province, it meant going to the Ontario College of Education at Toronto. The applicant must have reached his 20th birthday by October 1st, be a Canadian citizen or British subject, of good character, in good physical condition and possess an acceptable degree from a British university. The last condition implied that the degree needed to be approved with respect to its standard and content of courses by the Department of Education. To ensure further the quality of those admitted, each applicant was interviewed by the College selection committee consisting of three staff members and a representative from O.T.F.

The basic program offered by O.C.E. was the one-year course leading to the Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B, which was valid for two years. The certificate was made permanent with two years of successful teaching experience in a secondary school in the province. The candidate could also choose to take the one-year course leading to the Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type A if he possessed the additional requirements called for by the program. All applicants were enrolled in the Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B course, but only those who had attained a minimum of 60 per cent in the graduation of final courses of their degree program approved by the Department could enroll in the Type A certificate course. This course enabled the individual to specialize, both in theory and through practice teaching, in specific subject areas which included both academic and commercial courses offered in the secondary school curriculum. However,

it also meant for the student teacher having to take a supplementary course in his chosen area or areas of specialization during the regular session of the program or possibly during the summer session. The Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type A was also valid for two years and was made permanent after an equal duration of successful teaching experience anywhere in the province and in the area or areas of specialization.

Of Vocational School Teachers

O.C.E. was also the training college of candidates who intended to become vocational teachers. Candidates seeking admission to the one-year course leading to the Interim Ordinary Vocational Certificate in a trade subject had to be over twenty-three and under thirty-two years of age in the case of women applicants and over twenty-three and under thirty-five years of age in the case of men applicants. Candidates had to be in good physical condition, of good character, and hold a Secondary School Graduation Diploma or its equivalent. Those unable to fulfill the last condition could still qualify for admission by successfully writing examinations in English, mathematics and science given at the College on the first day of the regular session. Furthermore, before being admitted into the program, candidates had to demonstrate their competence in their trade. This included showing proof of apprenticeship training and journeyman experience and exhibiting their knowledge and skills in both written and practical examinations. The Interim Ordinary Vocational Certificate was valid for two years and qualified its holders to teach in a vocational school anywhere in the

province. The certificate was made permanent after two years of successful teaching experience.

Program offerings in the vocational field conducted by O.C.E. during its regular session also included the following: the one-year course leading to the Intermediate Certificate in Home Economics and the one or two-year courses leading to Elementary, Intermediate and Specialist certificates in Industrial Arts and Crafts. Only applicants who had graduated from a four-year industrial course at a vocational school and who could present evidence of, at least, one year of approved working experience in industry were admitted into the program. Moreover, the first year was waived for those who held a Second Class or more advanced teaching certificate and either the Elementary Manual Training Certificate or proof of successful completion of Part I of the Intermediate Arts and Crafts course, Type A or Type B.

For In-service Education

In-service education continued in 1950 to be a major means by which teachers obtained certificates of specialization, completed requirements for permanent certification, upgraded their academic qualifications, reviewed specific subject areas and, in general, improved their overall status in the profession. The years ahead would witness an expansion and greater diversification in program offerings in this important field of teacher education.

In 1950, holders of Interim First Class certificates were required to have two years of successful teaching experience before they could qualify for permanent certification. Those holding Second Class

certificates seeking to acquire First Class certification were required first, to complete the admission requirements for the First Class one-year course (viz., standing in five Grade 13 subjects, including one in English Literature or English Composition); second, to possess the equivalent of one year of study obtained through summer courses. This arrangement was discontinued in 1953 with the implementation of the emergency plan.

Summer courses were the route which both elementary and secondary school teachers followed in order to obtain special certificates in a variety of special areas. For elementary school teachers these included special certificates in arts, physical and health education, home economics, industrial arts and music. In most instances, one summer course in a given subject led to an Elementary Certificate, two summer courses to an Intermediate Certificate, and three or four courses to a Specialist or Supervisor's Certificate. Candidates for the High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B could take, during the regular session, a supplementary course leading to one of the following special certificates: the Elementary Arts and Crafts Certificate, Type A; the Elementary Commercial Certificate; the Elementary Industrial Arts and Crafts Certificate, Type A; the Elementary Instrumental Music Certificate; the Elementary Vocal Music Certificate, Type A,; the Elementary Physical Education Certificate, Type A; the Intermediate Home Economics Certificate; and the First Class Public School Certificate. Completion of requirements for these special certificates usually involved the taking of one or more summer courses in addition to the supplementary course followed during the regular session. Teachers wishing to upgrade the Elementary

Certificate to the Intermediate or Specialist level were required to follow additional summer courses.

In-service education at O.C.E. gave elementary school teachers the opportunity to work towards an Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B. Teachers holding either Permanent First or Permanent Second Class certificates and who had fulfilled the entrance requirements (in particular, had obtained an acceptable university degree) for the one-year course leading to an Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B could now qualify for the latter certificate by taking the final written and practical examinations and by completing a summer course at O.C.E.

3. The Emergency Plan of 1952-53

As mentioned earlier, in response to the Hope Commission's Interim Report of 1949, the Department set up a selection committee at each normal school. Members of these committees visited secondary schools in the province to interview prospective candidates to the teaching profession. The committees continued their work in 1951. This effort to improve recruitment of prospective elementary school teachers was supplemented by the "teaching try-out" experience plan designed to provide the opportunity to interested senior high school students of observing and teaching pupils in the classroom.

However, it was becoming evident that piece-meal efforts were not going to be sufficient to ameliorate the situation. Thus, in 1952 the Department announced that a reorganization of the system for the preparation of elementary school teachers would come into effect in

September, 1953.[25] In carrying out this reorganization, the Department had two stated objectives: 1) to improve the quality of teacher education; 2) to increase the supply of teachers.[26] The major step taken to accomplish the first objective was to raise the admission requirement to the one-year course leading to the Interim First Class Certificate from standing in five Grade 13 papers to standing in eight Grade 13 papers, including, as before, one English paper.[27] To achieve the second objective, the Department established a two-year course leading to an Interim First Class Certificate and opened it up to applicants holding the Secondary School Graduation Diploma, General Course, Grade 12 level.[28]

Since the new plan would not come into effect until the following September, 1953, the Department introduced immediately pre-teachers' college summer courses to be offered during the summer of 1952 at all normal schools with the exception of the University of Ottawa Normal School. Admission requirements were the same as those for the two-year course and upon successful completion of the first summer course, graduates received temporary certificates valid for one year. These certificates could be renewed for an additional year with another summer course. Holders of renewed certificates plus two years of teaching experience became eligible for admission to the one-year course leading to an Interim First Class Certificate. Thus, the new plan offered three distinct routes of admission to the teaching profession: 1) a one-year course for candidates possessing Grade 13 standing in eight papers, including one English paper; 2) a two-year program for those holding the Grade 12 Secondary School Graduation Diploma; 3) the one-year course

for successful candidates who chose to enter the profession by way of the pre-teachers' college summer courses.

The Department would continue the practice of allowing School Boards to hire individuals on letters of permission and letters of standing. The year that the reorganization scheme went into effect, the Department issued a total of 682 letters of permission and a total of 269 letters of standing.[29] In order to boost up the number of teachers coming from the latter grouping, the Department provided an added incentive as part of its emergency plan. Prior to 1955 persons teaching with a letter of standing valid for oneyear were required to write a final examination at the end of this period to qualify for certification. In 1953, the Department decided to waive this requirement and persons in this category were issued certificates upon completing one year of successful teaching in the province.[30] Judging from the number of letters of standing (623) issued during the following year, the incentive proved to be effective.[31]

The Minister's Report for the year 1954 records that all indications showed that progress was being made as a result of the Department's reorganization scheme. A total of 2,692 students were enrolled at the eight teachers' colleges, 960 more than the previous year, including 362 students enrolled in the one-year course.[32] Enrolment in the two-year course rose from 314 students in the first year to 391 in 1954.[33] The pre-teachers' college summer courses had also proven to be a success. In 1954, 272 graduates who had completed their summer courses and two years of teaching experience enrolled in the one-year course leading to certification.[34] As shown in Tables 3 and 4, progress would continue to be made through the decade and in the process the emergency plan

would outgrow its usefulness. Hence, as supply of elementary school teachers began to run parallel with the demands of the schools the emergency measures were discontinued (the pre-teachers' college summer courses in 1961 and the two-year course in 1966) and the one-year course requirements raised and in 1961 replaced by a new certification plan.

4. The 1955 Emergency Plan for the Training of Secondary School Teachers

A shortage of secondary school teachers did not begin to occur until 1955 when enrolments in the secondary school population began registering a significant increase. To counteract the developing teacher shortage, the Department took immediate action by introducing a special summer course designed to facilitate the conscription of university graduates into the profession.[35]

The summer course consisted of two sessions: the first, a ten-week course that commenced in the summer of 1955; and the second, a five-week course that was given the following summer. The basic admission requirements were the same as those prescribed for admission into the one-year course leading to the Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B. In addition, an applicant to this course must sign a contract with a School Board to occupy a teaching position for the year and for which no other qualified person had been found. The individual taught on a letter of permission and on the condition that he would enroll in the summer course. The person then applied to O.C.E. for admission into the first instalment of the summer course. Upon successful completion of the first part of the course, the individual

TABLE 3*

Enrolment in Ontario teachers' colleges, 1945–70

TEACHERS' COLLEGE	DATE ESTABLISHED	1945–6	1950–1	1955–6	1960–1	1961–2	1962–3	1963–4	1964–5	1965–6	1966–7	1967–8	1968–9	1969–70
Hamilton	1908	87	245	423	908	889	741	881	804	626	677	780	1,015	904
Lakehead	1960				207	231	215	224	237	141	140	184	260	188
Lakeshore	1959				989	766	612	807	817	758	871	874	1,195	922
London	1900	128	236	470	1,009	910	501	571	582	546	615	554	816	697
North Bay	1909	66	141	266	412	423	382	416	405	288	322	353	546	487
Ottawa	1875	118	185	304	710	676	632	761	832	666	608	746	1,097	910
Ottawa, Univ. of	1927	147	155	228	364	358	302	235	218	230	235	316	280	278
Peterborough	1908	91	128	177	464	402	370	344	324	292	396	367	501	398
St Catharines	1965									219	333	350	458	368
Stratford	1908	113	129	273	450	377	343	363	356	354	376	396	481	372
Sudbury	1963							147	142	156	170	134	165	181
Toronto	1847	269	484	998	1,217	1,026	922	1,214	1,324	1,330	1,539	1,510	2,036	1,771
Windsor	1962						494	447	421	307	252	289	427	420
TOTAL		1,019	1,703	3,139	6,730	6,058	5,514	6,410	6,462	5,913	6,534	6,853	9,277	7,896

SOURCE: Reports of the Minister of Education of Ontario.

NOTE: Beginning with 1955–6, enrolments have been recorded as of October.

* W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. II: The Expansion of the Educational System, p. 225.

TABLE 4*

Enrolment in Ontario colleges of education by course and program, 1945–70

YEAR	COLLEGE OF EDUCATION	ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT					VOCATIONAL DEPARTMENT					TOTAL REGULAR SESSION		SPECIAL SUMMER COURSE*	
		Type A	Type B only	Male	Female	TOTAL	Ordinary Vocational			Industrial Arts and Crafts*	Intermediate Home Economics	Male	Female	First year	Second year
							Male	Female	Total						
1945–6	Univ. of Toronto	131	153			284					5				
1950–1	Univ. of Toronto	202	230			432			19	13	10				
1955–6	Univ. of Toronto	110	198	172	136	308	42	3	45	30		214	139	419	
1960–1	Univ. of Toronto	136	323	272	187	459	76	1	77	62		348	188	1,035	866
1961–2	Univ. of Toronto	148	434			582			281	47				1,222	895
1962–3	Univ. of Toronto	157	426	306	277	583	260	4	264			566	281	1,501	1,139
1963–4	Univ. of Toronto	153	319	250	222	472	242	5	247			492	227	1,812	1,366
1964–5	Univ. of Toronto	191	375	272	294	566	235	15	250			507	309	1,932	1,566
1965–6	Althouse			78	91	169	26	2	28			104	93		
	Univ. of Toronto			255	302	557	164	19	183			419	321		
	Total	244	482	333	393	726	190	21	211			523	414	2,209	1,744
1966–7	Althouse	93	144	116	123	239	40	4	44			156	127		
	Univ. of Toronto	168	358	199	327	526	165	15	180			364	342		
	Total	263	502	315	450	765	205	19	224			520	469	2,281	1,962
1967–8	Althouse	68	193	120	141	261	24	8	32			144	149		
	Univ. of Toronto	215	511	305	421	726	151	24	175			456	445		
	Total	283	704	425	562	987	175	32	207			600	594	2,664	2,016
1968–9	Althouse	103	360	251	212	463	65	5	70			316	217		
	McArthur	39	155	84	110	194						84	110		
	Univ. of Toronto	264	908	487	685	1,172	172	45	217			659	730		
	Total	406	1,423	822	1,007	1,829	237	50	287			1,059	1,057	3,225	2,519
1969–70	Althouse	225	368	264	329	593	44	8	52			308	337		
	McArthur	105	118	84	139	223						84	139		
	Univ. of Ottawa	4	76	50	30	80						50	30		
	Univ. of Toronto	395	1,346	658	1,083	1,741	132	53	185			790	1,136		
	Total	729	1,908	1,056	1,581	2,637	176	61	237			1,232	1,642	812	3,041

SOURCE: Reports of the Minister of Education of Ontario.

* W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. II: The Expansion of the Educational System, p. 228.

*Special summer course at Kingston and London, as well as Toronto, from 1960 on.
*All male.

received a letter of standing valid for one year. If he did not successfully complete the course, he was allowed to retain his letter of permission for one year, but he could not renew it at the end of this period. On the other hand, the successful candidate could renew his letter of standing at the end of his one year of teaching on the recommendation of his school principal and secondary school inspector and on the condition that he attend the second part of the summer course. The successful completion of the second instalment of the summer course led to the award of the Interim High School Assistant's Certificate, Type B.

Despite its apparent success, the special summer course had unique shortcomings for both the students and the system. For the prospective candidate, it was a short cut into the profession. However, at the same time it short-changed him, for it deprived him of the added advantage of the supplementary courses available to those enrolled in the regular session (the one-year course). He had to pursue the in-service route (through summer courses) to acquire specialization in a specific subject area. For the system, the introduction of the special summer course meant the immediate decline in enrolments in the regular session leading to the Type B Certificate. The short duration of the special course lured many prospective applicants away from the one-year program.

A total of 418 students registered for the first summer course in 1955.[36] Of these, a total of 376 enrolled in the second instalment of the course the following July, 1956.[37] During the following year, (1957) there was a further increase (499) in the enrolment figure of those starting the first ten-week course.[38] These figures continued to increase year by year, thus helping to alleviate the teacher shortage.

Notwithstanding its obvious success in improving the teacher

supply required by the growing secondary school population, the special summer course, just as the emergency program developed in 1953 to increase the supply of elementary school teachers, was not free of controversy and opposition. The Department viewed the course as the best solution to a very critical situation. It was thought that the special course would help maintain the highest academic standards (at least, equivalent to those in the one-year course) by requiring all candidates to hold an acceptable university degree and at the same time accelerate placement of new teachers in the schools by reducing the period of professional training. Furthermore, the latter was supplemented by one year of supervised (at least in principle) teaching in a secondary school. However, many within the profession believed that the duration of the summer course, which in 1960 and 1961 was revised to consist of two eight-week summer sessions, was not a sufficient length of time to provide the quality of professional training to prepare the prospective teacher for the classroom. This was O.C.E. Dean D.F. Dadson's major criticism of the course: "... it is too short a time for a prospective teacher to become imbued with his professional responsibilities. All learning takes time and the acquisition of a good professional attitude takes considerable time."[39] Opposition to the course also came from a special ad hoc committee established by Minister Davis in 1968 and chaired by T.D. Boone, then Director of Education for Etobicoke.[40] In May 1967, the announcement was made that the special summer course would come to an end.[41] The first part of the course was offered for the last time during the summer of 1968 and the second instalment during the summer of 1969. Nevertheless, a summer route was retained and restricted to those who

qualified under the category of "mature student".[42] Such a student held an acceptable university degree and possessed at least five years of employment or other experience after Grade 13 or equivalent, with a three-year degree, four years with a four-year degree, and at least three years with a Master's degree. Hence, the emergency summer course was over and the Minister's Report for 1968 states, with a sense of relief, that "The decision (to terminate the course), based on recommendations from leading educational organizations, received unanimous approval from the members of a special Minister's Committee on Secondary School Teacher Training (the Boone Committee) in 1968".[43]

5. The Institutionalization of In-Service Education

Over the years, some form of in-service education has compensated for either the inadequate academic preparation or insufficient professional training of the Ontario teacher. This was particularly true during the period of increasing enrolments in the schools. In fact, in-service education was an integral part of the 1952-53 emergency plan for the training of elementary school teachers and became a part of the 1955 scheme for the training of secondary school teachers. During these emergency years, in-service education was for most teachers the only means by which their professional needs were met. However, as the emergency situation subsided, the teacher supply improved, and the system expanded, in-service education assumed a more positive role in the life of the teacher by assisting him in achieving both personal and professional fulfillment in his work.

Recognition of the important place occupied by in-service education toward the growth of teachers was given by the Department of Education through its creation, in June, 1957, of the Professional Development Branch, headed by a Superintendent of Professional Development and two assistants. This branch co-operated with the Elementary Education Branch in helping school inspectors set up various types of in-service education programs and with the Registrar's Branch and other superintendents in the Department, in supervising all Departmental summer courses with the exception of those that came under the direct control of the Teacher Education Branch. After just six months in operation, its first Superintendent, C.B. Routley, was able to report that Branch officials had visited the Departmental summer courses in Toronto, London, Hamilton, Ottawa, and Sudbury and had addressed 3,487 students.[44] Moreover, officials had also conducted workshops for teachers, assisted at educational conferences and panel discussions, and visited teachers' institutes where they had addressed approximately 5000 teachers.[45]

The creation of this special Branch was the government's way of institutionalizing an operation which the Department had been conducting for some time. However, this is not to imply that the Department was alone in this field. Teachers' organizations continued at that time to provide their membership with varied opportunities by which to improve themselves. For example, in the summer of 1955, the Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation (O.S.S.T.F.) started two-week summer courses in Grade 13 chemistry and physics.[46] These courses were originally intended to provide assistance to individuals teaching these subjects for the first time. However, from the very beginning they included other

teachers who were taking these courses in order to observe different teaching methods and for review purposes. By 1958, the program had expanded to include courses in mathematics, English, Latin, and French; and by the following summer the subjects offered included history, biology, algebra, geometry, trigonometry and Grade 12 English, physics, and chemistry.[47] In subsequent years, O.S.S.T.F. further expanded its program offerings to include subjects down to the Grade 9 level.[48] Also deserving mention is the effort of the Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation (O.P.S.M.T.F.) in this direction. By 1953, it initiated a ten-day summer course in school supervision and administration, which after several successful years of operation, was placed under the control of the Ontario Teachers' Federation.[49] During the same period, O.P.S.M.T.F. also conducted summer school in classroom practices in Grades 7 and 8.[50] This program came to an end when the Department entered this subject area with its own course offerings. Furthermore, universities provided through their extramural and extension programs an opportunity especially to elementary school teachers to work towards their Bachelor's degree. The 1961 certification plan for elementary school teachers, introducing a four-standard certificate by which the attainment of standards three to four was annexed in part to the accumulation of university credits, further expanded the universities' operations in this field. And, of course, O.C.E. and the Faculty of Psychology and Education at the University of Ottawa conducted post-graduate programs for those teachers who wished to pursue more advanced studies. By the end of this period (1965), post-graduate opportunities received a big boost with the establishment of the Ontario Institute for Studies

in Education.[51]

Notwithstanding the importance of these other agents of in-service education, Departmental summer courses remained, during this period, the major single vehicle for the training and improvement of teachers in the field. The certification plan of 1961 further increased enrolments in these courses. Under the new scheme, teachers could substitute the equivalent number of university courses required to qualify for a Standard 2 Certificate and half the number of university courses required for a Standard 3 Certificate with Departmental courses. Thus, between 1961 and 1965 the number of teachers attending these courses rose from 7,079 to 11,826, an increase of approximately sixty-seven per cent (See Table 5).[52] Illustrating thevariety of courses offered by the Department is the list for the summer of 1965:[53]

Art: Elementary, Intermediate, Supervisor's, Specialist: at Toronto
Elementary, Intermediate Part 1: at Sarnia
Elementary: at Brockville and Sudbury
Audio-Visual Methods: at Barrie, Ottawa, Stratford and Toronto
Auxiliary Education: Elementary, Intermediate, Specialist: at Toronto
Elementary: at Belleville and North Bay
Elementary School Teacher-Librarians, Parts I and II: at Toronto
Grade 13 Subjects: at Toronto
Guidance: Elementary, Intermediate, Specialist: at Toronto
Elementary: at Lindsay, London and Port Arthur
Industrial Arts: Elementary, Parts I and II, and Supervisor's, Parts I and II: at Toronto
Intermediate Division Mathematics (Grades 7 & 8): at Chatham, Cornwall and Toronto
Intermediate Education (Grades 7 & 8): at Renfrew
Junior Education: at Alvinston and Dryden
Language Arts: at Toronto
Music: Vocal (for Elementary Schools) Elementary Type B, Intermediate Type B, Supervisor's: at Toronto
Vocal (for Secondary Schools) Intermediate Type A, Parts I and II, and Specialist: at Toronto
Instrumental (for Elementary Schools) Elementary Type B, Intermedíate Type B, Supervisor's: at Toronto
Instrumental (for Secondary Schools) Intermediate Type A

Parts I and II, and Specialist: at Toronto
Physical and Health Education:
Type B, Combined courses for men and women, Elementary, Intermediate Parts I and II, Supervisor's (Units 1,2,3, and 4): at Hamilton
Elementary, Intermediate Parts I and II (Units 1,2 and 3): at Guelph
Elementary, Intermediate Part I (Units 1 - 2) only): at Toronto and Windsor

N.B. - Intermediate Part II may be taken at Toronto or Windsor if Unit 3 has been taken previously.
Primary Education, Supervisor's: at Toronto
Primary Methods: Parts I and II; at Hamilton, London, Ottawa and Toronto Part II: at Sault Ste. Marie.

Secondary School Principals, Parts I and II, at London) July 5 to July 30
Part I, at Kingston)
Teaching English as a Second Language: at Toronto
The Teaching of French to English-speaking Pupils in Elementary Schools: at Ottawa and Toronto
Teaching the Deaf: at Belleville

Short Courses

Art Refresher: at Toronto
Heads of Departments (Secondary): at London
Intermediate Division Mathematics (Grades 9 and 10): at Toronto
Mathematics for Grades 11 and 12 Refresher: at Waterloo
Music (Vocal and Instrumental) Refresher: at Toronto

During the next period (from 1966 to 1976) that will be considered in this study, in-service education continued to play an important role. In response to the demand for greater competency and higher qualifications, teachers would seek out and enrol in programs of study that would enable them to achieve these ends. This movement would be greatly facilitated by the integration of teachers' colleges and universities, the establishment of new colleges and subsequently faculties of education, the development of graduate programs in these faculties, and in general by the prevailing view of education (generated to some extent by the Wright Commission on Post-Secondary Education) as a life-long, continuing process.

TABLE 5*

Enrolment in Department of Education summer courses, 1945-65

COURSE	1945	1950	1955	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Agriculture	87	112	22	20					
Art	144	511	437	683	837	1,002	1,273	1,300	1,575
Art et Science du Langage									
Business and Commercial Subjects									
Chassis Dynamometer									
Compensatory Education									
Commercial Subjects	99	131	147						
Dance									
Elementary Mathematics, Grades 1 to 6									
Elementary School Librarians (Elementary School Teacher-Librarian prior to 1968)						80	114	130	282
Elementary School Principals' Course									
Elementary School Principals' Refresher Course		60	49	50					
Elementary Science									
Elementary Social Studies									
Fundamentals of Educational Television									
Grade 13 Subjects		161	180	408	529	133	120	70	49
Guidance	150	116	165	259	346	565	735	915	1,155
Heads of Departments						324	404		361
High School Assistant's, Type B	80	91	91						
Home Economics	56	80	75						
Industrial Arts	133	154	127	168	169	132	144	151	144
Integrated Studies									
Intermediate Education, Grades 7 and 8				74			126	143	97
Intermediate Geography and History, Grades 7 and 8									
Intermediate Mathematics, Grades 7 and 8							123	387	800
Intermediate Mathematics, Grades 9 and 10							45	49	
Intermediate Science, Grades 7 and 8						96	83		
Junior Education				231	281	412	558	306	166
Language Arts									96
Learning Materials Management (Audio Visual Methods Advanced prior to 1969)									
Learning Materials Methodology (Audio Visual Methods prior to 1969)		28	66	294	395	477	614	620	776
Mathematics, Grade 11								209	
Mathematics, Grades 11 and 12									202
Mathematics, Grade 13									
Music, Instrumental			96	165	206	175	175	188	240
Music, Vocal	327	416	449	491	619	589	512	536	545
New Horizons for Young Children									
New Techniques in the Teaching of Modern Languages									
Oral French	27								
Physical and Health Education, Type B	145	216	293	769	968	1,105	1,297	1,283	1,331
Primary Education, Supervisors'				89	80	92	148	95	98
Primary Methods	168	556	881	1,372	1,715	2,130	2,079	1,957	1,895
Refresher Latin	28								
Refresher Science	34								
Refresher History	52								
School Librarianship		6	24	51	58				
Science Field Studies									
Secondary School Principals'			90	139	83	209	212	173	264
Special Education (Auxiliary Education before 1966)	127	165	255	561	715	896	986	1,111	1,293
Teaching the Deaf									30
Teaching English as a Second Language				44	78	67	88	88	120
Teaching French to English-Speaking Pupils, Regular							134	78	151
Teaching French to English-Speaking Pupils, Special									156
Teaching French to English-Speaking Pupils, Intensive									
Teaching the Trainable Retarded									
Vocational Courses	43		105						
Workshop in Curriculum Building		275							
TOTAL	1,700	3,078	3,552	5,868	7,079	8,484	9,970	9,789	11,826

SOURCE: Reports of the Minister of Education of Ontario.

*W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. II: The Expansion of the Educational System, pp. 238-39.

6. The Patten Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers

In the midst of expansion and reorganization of the secondary schools, and the increasing demand in the supply of high school teachers, the Minister of Education appointed on February 23, 1961 a committee to enquire into the training of secondary school teachers in Ontario. The Committee was to be chaired by F.G. Patten, then Superintendent of Secondary Schools for the City of Ottawa. Its membership included representatives from most major educational institutions and organizations of the province concerned with secondary schools. The general terms of reference were wide in scope, "to make recommendations on all matters pertaining to the preparation of secondary school teachers, including the possible establishment of additional training institutions in the Province".[54] The Committee completed its task in fourteen months, submitting the final draft of its report in October, 1962.

From the outset, the Committee stressed the important role schools play in the life of society, expressing the view that "teaching is one of the most important forms of public service".[55] According to the Committee, the performance of this service requires competent teachers who not only realize the grand object of their calling but also possess the dedication to pursue it with vigour.[56] If these are the requirements of a true teacher, they argued, then these same standards should also be the criteria by which to assess a teacher education program. "The success of a college of education must be gauged by the competence and dedication with which its graduates are equipped to participate in the increasing complexities of education."[57]

The Committee acknowledged not only the changes taking place in

the secondary school curriculum offering a greater number of options to the student through the reorganized program, but also the reality of a continually and rapidly changing society. In doing so, the Committee members wished to point out and accentuate the need to have in the schools teachers who were specialized in a number of optional subjects and who could assist their students in coping with the complex and changing conditions in society.

> "Teachers must be trained not only in the changing aspects of secondary schools but also in the fact of change itself. This will cause the college (of education) not only to develop its own leadership role and flexibility but also to insist on the development of such qualities in the individual students under its instruction."[58]

The Committee seems to have felt that O.C.E. could fulfil its object of providing the schools with competent teachers only by assuming the role of "prime mover of educational change".[59]

The ideal candidate for secondary school teacher training was deemed by the Committee to possess the following qualities, differing according to the different route chosen by the individual candidate: "the love of scholarship or pride in technical excellence and the possession of certain personal attributes".[60] The candidate with a general education background (the three-year degree) was viewed with both caution and interest. The Committee was of the opinion that such a background tended to be "shallow" and "meaningless" especially when applied to teaching, though it admitted that a general education gave its bearers a "breadth of interest" and "flexibility" which, the Committee believed, "contributed to the well-being of the profession".[61] The candidate with an honour's degree or specialization in a specific area brought to O.C.E. "a sense of scholarship and achievement" which, the Committee maintained, greatly improved the quality of instruction.[62]

The third type of candidate with a technical background, though often lacking in theoretical knowledge, brought with him, in addition to his deeply ingrained skills, a highly developed sense of maturity and responsibility.[63] Furthermore, the Committee's ideal candidate would be a person having convictions about man's ultimate purpose in life and of the means of attaining it, a man or a woman of dedication ready to meet the challenges offered through teaching, an individual keenly aware of the changing nature of knowledge and of his social environment.[64]

Implicit in their depiction of the ideal candidate for secondary school teacher training was the Committee members' preference for a consecutive program of teacher education -- general education (or an honour's degree) followed by professional training. They perceived a concurrent program as having negative effects on both its professional and academic components. Such a program, they maintained, tended to dilute the course content of the academic component by its emphasis on the vocational aspect of the program.[65] They felt that a concurrent program segregated its students into a faculty of education very early in their undergraduate years, thus further identifying such a course of study with its utility at the expense of the general education.[66] Moreover, they saw the concurrent plan as a dead end for the prospective teacher. "Graduates in education under a concurrent training program have almost no routes to post-graduate studies except by further progress in education studies."[67] However, it would seem that the overriding reason for their vehement opposition to a concurrent teacher education program was political -- they feared the loss of the Department of

Education's authority over teacher training were the university asked to set up such a program.

> "The assignment of full responsibility for teacher training either to an independent institution or to a Faculty of Education within a university involves too great a delegation of authority. The college or the university would in effect exercise complete control through its powers of appointment to staff, its authority over entrance requirements and courses of study and its degree-conferring powers and would resent, in the name of academic freedom, any external interference with these rights once conferred, no matter how they might conflict with the public policy. Such an assignment of the authority to determine the qualifications of teachers and to all intents, their actual certification, is difficult to justify."[68]

It is interesting to note that the fears expressed by the Minister's Committee were quickly realized and became the very stumbling blocks that impeded and retarded negotiations between the Ministry and the universities during the years of integration of the teacher's colleges and the latter institutions. These fears would also be reflected in the early seventies with the Department of Education's retention of the two campuses of the Ontario Teacher Education College (Toronto, Hamilton) under its own control. Indeed the question of state control versus non-state control in education has been a grave point of political contention ever since the Ryerson years and especially since the Department of Education was officially politicized in 1876 and thereafter became more deeply embroiled in party-politics. It might well be expected that the politicization of education amid the interplay of forces of a constitutional democracy would have helped, over the years, to bring about a resolution of this question. This has certainly not occurred to any great extent. There still appear to be remnant elements, of Ryersonian character, in the civil institutions

concerned that may be interpreted as having a polarizing effect curbing the democratic forces of the kind of society to which Ontario aspires.

While the Minister's Committee was adamant in its opposition to a concurrent teacher training program, it could not easily dismiss the advantages close co-operation and affiliation with a university would bring to teacher education: "The staff of a college of a graduate school can be strengthened and assisted by a close association with a university, and its student body can profit by access to the facilities of the larger institution and by sharing its traditions and scholarly atmosphere."[69] For these reasons, the Committee heartily endorsed the institutional arrangement of O.C.E. with the University of Toronto, with the latter providing all its resources in support of the former, and with O.C.E. and the Department of Education retaining complete control over the teacher training program. Furthermore, the Patten Committee went on to recommend that "as new colleges of education are established each should follow this pattern of a graduate school in close relationship to a university".[70] This the Department would soon do with the establishment of McArthur College (1965) in Kingston as an affiliate of Queen's University and Althouse College (also in 1965) in London, as an affiliate of the University of Western Ontario.

In anticipation of the Department's intention to establish new colleges for the training of secondary school teachers, the Patten Committee proposed a model of an agreement to be made between the colleges and the universities. In doing so, they hoped to improve on the agreement made in 1920 between O.C.E. and the University of Toronto, which both the Hope Commission and the Minister's Committee

had found too general in its delineation of "the respective authority and responsibility of the contracting parties".[71] As noted earlier, O.C.E. would in 1965 sign a new agreement with the University of Toronto in order to update and rectify the weaknesses present in the 1920 agreement. The form of agreement that was eventually adopted by the Minister of Education and the universities followed closely that proposed by the Minister's Committee.

The model agreement stipulated that admission to the new colleges of education would be made "without regard to geographical area of domicile," as was the policy and practice in the normal schools of the province.[72] In the second clause of the proposed model of agreement, the Committee took the opportunity to restate its opposition to the concurrent plan for teacher education by asserting that the minimum admission requirement to a college of education, except for those candidates applying for vocational courses, was an acceptable Bachelor's degree.[73]

The model agreement called for the establishment of an Advisory Board of the College, consisting of the dean, four representatives appointed by the Minister, four by the university president and four by the Ontario Teachers' Federation. The function of the Board was to advise the president of the university on all matters affecting the college. The agreement also called for the formation of the Council of the College. This body would be under the chairmanship of the dean and consist of college staff holding professional rank, representatives, of staff from other departments of the university, and members in the

rank of associate teachers. The latter group, however, would have the privilege of participating in Council debates but would not have the power to vote. The Committee did not state the exact function of the Council, but it can be inferred from the comments made following the outlining of the model agreement that the Council would consider all matters relating to the college's operations.[74] In recommending the institution of these two bodies, the Committee hoped to ensure close and continuous co-operation between the college and the university.

Other clauses in the model agreement further reflected the above object of the Committee. The dean of the college would be appointed by the university's Board of Governors on the recommendation of the president. However, it was stipulated all nominations for the position would come to the president exclusively from the Advisory Board, which would also ensure that the nominations were acceptable to the Minister of Education. Clauses to that effect can be found in the agreements signed with respect to the establishment of both McArthur and Althouse colleges. A similar procedure was recommended by the Committee in the making of both academic and non-academic staff appointments. Such appointments "shall be made by the Board of Governors on the recommendation of the President. Recommendations of the Dean for such appointments shall be made to the President after consultation with the Advisory Board."[75] In this case, approval of the Minister would not be required, since the Committee felt that the Minister could always indicate his views concerning such matters through the dean or through his representatives on the Advisory Board.

The Committee's proposed model agreement gave the university complete control over admission requirements and the administration of the program of study. The Committee believed also in this case that the Minister's interests would be safeguarded by his representation on the Advisory Board. However, as the Althouse, McArthur and the new College of Education, University of Toronto agreements would show, the Committee's clause was not acceptable to the Minister. In the matters covered under the proposed clause, the universities would be given complete control only over the setting up of post-graduate programs in education. In other matters, consultation with and approval by the Minister were required.

The remaining clauses of the model agreement reiterated the Department's authority with respect to certification, endorsed essentially the existing practice of financing the colleges, provided for the external assessment of the colleges' overall operation, made the establishment of a fee schedule (except for post-graduate studies) subject to the Minister's approval, and specified the conditions for the termination of the agreement by either party.

Another pertinent recommendation made by the Patten Committee was that "At least two new colleges of education ... be established in different parts of the province".[76] According to W.G. Fleming, there was no causal connection between this recommendation and the Minister's decision to establish colleges in Kingston and London. Fleming maintained that this development was implied in the extension of the special summer course at these two locations in 1960.[77] Plans

to go ahead with McArthur and Althouse colleges were already under way long before the release of the Minister's Committee Report in 1962.

Regardless of whether or not the Committee influenced the founding of McArthur and Althouse colleges and despite the Ministry's slow acceptance of its recommendations, it provided a plan by which to bring closer together the training of secondary school teachers with universities and in an indirect and purely unintentional way, accelerated the momentum of the integration process of teachers' colleges with universities. However, the integrated colleges, in accordance with the recommendation of another Minister's Committee (the MacLeod Committee) would be free in implementing either a consecutive and/or concurrent program of teacher education. Lastly, it may be noted that, by the late sixties, the Department had implemented over 100 of the Committee's 143 recommendations.[78]

7. The Staff Conference Report

Paving the way for the institution of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers and for the subsequent changes that were made in teacher education as a direct result of the Committee's recommendations was a report entitled "Suggested Changes in the One Year Course at the Ontario Teachers' Colleges." The document consists of eighteen reports representing the views of the staff of the teachers' colleges who met at a two-day conference at Toronto Teachers' College on April 1 and 2, 1964. The conference was organized jointly by the Teacher Education Branch and the Ontario

Teachers' College Association. The purpose of the gathering, as implied by the title of the report, was to evaluate the future of the one-year course.

The report dealing with the selection of student teachers made several recommendations in regard to raising the admission requirements. It called for the equalization of entrance requirements to teachers' colleges with those demanded for admission from Grade 13 to an Ontario university.[79] Included were the following recommendations: that candidates entering an English-speaking teachers' college be required to hold an average higher than sixty per cent in English paper(s); that those candidates entering a bilingual teachers' college be required to have an average higher than sixty per cent in the English or French papers; that Grade 13 history be required of all candidates; that prospective candidates be encouraged to take geography and the biological sciences and to supplement these subjects by an adequate knowledge of art and music.[80] Finally, the group responsible for this particular report strongly recommended that no exception be made for those unable to meet the above entrance requirements.[81]

Some significant recommendations were made by Group 17 on "The College and Local Autonomy." The title of the report is somewhat misleading since the recommendations that follow were not as radical as one would expect. The Group observed that there had been a definite movement towards local autonomy during this period and thought that this trend might eventually lead to the transference of control over teacher education from the Department of Education to other bodies such as a commission, faculty of education, professional organization

or complete control comparable to that enjoyed by universities.[82] However, instead of supporting these observations with forceful and radical recommendations, Group 17 remained satisfied with making a few unintimidating suggestions which they hoped would increase autonomy within the existing framework of the Department of Education. They recommended that teachers' colleges remain subject to Departmental regulations regarding admissions and urged the teachers' records be made in duplicate, one copy for the college and another for the Department.[83] Teachers' college students should be asked to pay a fee equal to one-half of their operating cost.[84] They somewhat timidly recommended more control by teachers' colleges over their travel and maintenance budget -- "within the framework of the amounts budgeted per month and subject to a monthly accounting".[85] Other important recommendations made by this Group included the following: 1) that the principal and staff be granted more responsibility over staff requirements and over the selection of new staff; 2) that the Department should continue to provide the general subject areas of the curriculum while more responsibility be given to the principal and staff over the detailing of each course, methods of instruction, period allotments, textbooks, and the amount and type of specialization; 3) that while the Department should continue to provide leadership to the teachers' colleges, the principal should be granted greater control over the co-ordination of the instructional program and the supervision within the college, with the subject department heads over the co-ordination of the subject areas, and staff assuming responsibility in maintaining the quality of teaching; 4) that the timetabling of final examinations within the period set by the Department

become the responsibility of the teachers' colleges; 5) that teachers' colleges be allowed to take more of an initiative and exercise more control over the professional development of their own staffs and the in-service education of teachers; 6) and that for the time being certification remain the "right" of the Department.[86]

It was left to Group 18 chaired by J.D. Stennett to tackle the task of looking into the future of elementary school teacher education. Their succinct yet lengthy report shows that this Group must have had no difficulty in reaching a consensus on the recommendations proposed. The Group suggested two major changes: a longer period of preparation and the affiliation of teachers' colleges with universities.[87]

Previewing in its general outline the contents of the York University proposal, the Group recommended a four-year teacher education program after Grade 13 conducted on a concurrent plan.[88] The first two years would provide the student with a broad education in the liberal arts and sciences. During these first two years, the student could also begin selecting courses leading to a concentration in a major field of study related to teaching. Half of the program in the latter two years would be taken up by professional education -- "deliberate study of education as a profession".[89] This part of the program would consist of professional courses and supervised experience in practice teaching. The Group further recommended that an internship in the schools between the third and fourth year be made obligatory.[90] The concurrent plan would have one principal objective: the production of "mature", "scholarly", and "competent" teachers.[91]

At the same time, Group 18 recommended that the colleges of education within the universities become the educational centres of

both elementary and secondary school teachers; that post-graduate work for teachers become more diversified so as to include liberal arts and science courses as well as professional subjects; and that provision be made for individuals holding a Bachelor's degree to take a one-year professional course, preceded and followed by internship in the schools -- part in September before university registration and the other, in May and June after completion of the program.[92]

The members of this Group realized that such changes in the teacher education program of the province could not be made overnight. For this reason, they proposed a series of steps that the Department could take in working towards the implementation of their recommendations. They recommended the retention of the one-year course as a means of balancing the supply with the demand of teachers during a given year.[93] As a way of gradually phasing-in their ideal program, the Group proposed the introduction of an optional two-year course that would consist of a one-year university program and a one-year education program to be offered either consecutively or concurrently.[94] Graduates of this program would receive a Standard 2 certificate. In the meantime, the Group wanted to see the establishment of the proposed multi-purpose colleges of education within universities for the preparation of both elementary and secondary school teachers.[95] These multi-purpose colleges would offer three types of program leading to a first degree and certification: 1) a teacher education course concurrent with liberal arts and sciences in the third and fourth year; 2) a course concurrent with honours arts and sciences in the fourth and fifth years; 3) a one-year course for those entering the college with an

acceptable B.A. or an Honours B.A. In addition, the colleges would also develop their own graduate studies and research facilities, thus not only expanding their services and facilities but also strengthening their respective power base. The model proposed did not contain any new ideas. Group 18 simply combined an adapted version of the O.C.E. model with innovative recommendations regarding teacher education that had been made during the previous fifteen years and came up with a proposal that would find receptive ears in the years ahead. In particular, the Group acknowledged the Robbins reports and the Bowling Green Conference of 1958 as having exerted a special influence on the formulation of their recommendations.[96]

Lastly, the Group recommended the establishment of a Commission for the purpose of advising the Minister of Education and the Department of University Affairs regarding all matters relating to the construction of the colleges of education, curriculum and certification.[97] The Commission would have a membership consisting of appointed representatives by the Minister of Education from the Teachers' Federation, the Trustees Association and the universities.

8. The Establishment of O.I.S.E. in 1965

The exact reasons for the establishment of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education are not quite clear. In his Ontario's Educative Society, W.G. Fleming, who himself played a central role in the early stages of the Institute's development, speculates that Minister of Education, William Davis, considered several factors in

arriving at his decision. Davis, according to Fleming, must have considered the investment value research and development had for commerce and industry and perceived parallel advantages for education.[98] Secondly, playing an equally important part in his decision was Davis' belief that, if progress in education were to made, it required the "breaking down of structural rigidities in the system and in the decentralization of responsibility" -- a task which would be greatly facilitated by the infusion into the system of new and sound ideas.[99] At that time, Dr. Robert W.B. Jackson, then the head of O.C.E.'s Department of Educational Research and later O.I.S.E.'s first director, was a close advisor and consultant to the Minister of Education and Fleming was of the opinion that his influence in this matter was of "vital importance".[100] Fleming also notes a political factor which may have prompted Davis to take action in the area of educational research. In the Legislature, the opposition brought to the Minister's attention the discrepancy that existed between the proportion of the budget expended on education and the amount allotted to educational research in relationship to the research funding granted to other departments of government.[101] It was argued that since the budget for education was approaching 400 million dollars that the allocation of 10 million dollars to educational research was not unreasonable. Davis was also reminded that earlier reforms (viz., the Robarts Plan) in education in Ontario had been implemented without any previous extensive research.[102]

Credit for the development of O.I.S.E., at least in an indirect

but nonetheless significant way, was given to the then Premier John P. Robarts by Bora Laskin (now Chief Justice of Canada), first chairman of the Institute's Board of Governors, in his "Foreword" to the "First Annual Report". There he maintained that the establishment of the Institute was foreshadowed in a major government policy statement made by Robarts in February, 1965 when he addressed himself to the implications that social and technological change would have on the lives of the people of Ontario.[103] Robarts had expressed the view that such forces could be held under control and that education could play a key role in assisting people to prepare themselves for inevitable changes.[104] He also noted that this might imply the restructuring and redevelopment of the whole educational system, and that such modifications would require careful planning.[105] He believed that success in planning for the future could be ensured, following the example in industry, only through research and development.[106] According to Laskin, Robarts then delegated the responsibility for the implementation of his policy to Davis, who at that time, was both Minister of Education and Minister of University Affairs.[107] As part of his reform strategy, Davis established the Institute. "The government," stated Laskin, "has brought into existence ... the instrument by which we may, through research and development, continuously and systematically evaluate and improve the educational system of the province."[108] As Premier and former Minister of Education, Robarts must have provided some degree of direction to the work of the Ministry. However, there does not seem to be any apparent direct connection between the policy statement made by Robarts in February, 1965 and the actual plans to

establish the Institite. The policy statement was simply a way of rubber stamping the latter plans which were in the making early in 1964.

The Institute was brought into existence by The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Act, passed by the Legislature on June 22, 1965. Clause 13 of the Act made the merger of the Department of Educational Research and the Ontario Curriculum Institute a legal reality, thus making these two educational agencies the foundations of the new Institute. The establishment of O.I.S.E. constituted not only the apex of the growth experienced during this period but a milestone in the history of public education in Ontario. The emphasis must be placed on "public" since the Institute can be viewed as an investment on the part of the people of Ontario, in the words of Bora Laskin, "in the human resources of the province".[109] He continued by concluding that:

> "The Institute is, therefore, a public body, in the best sense of that overworked phrase, established deliberately by the government as part of its overall long-range policy to foster, particularly through its very substantial efforts in education at all levels of the school system, the social and economic growth and development of our province."[110]

Expressed in the latter statement is the belief, cherished by educators down through the years, that public schooling can play a vital part in the advancement of man, though not necessarily towards his spiritual perfection as was the case in Ryerson's day, but towards progress in his social and economic prosperity in this life.

The new Institute would be primarily devoted to graduate instruction, research, and development. In its first year of operation it had eight

studies divisions: Educational Administration, Applied Psychology, Curriculum Research and Instructional Techniques (changed later to simply "Curriculum"), Field Services, Educational Foundations (later chanted to History and Philosophy of Education), Information and Data Systems, Measurement and Evaluation, and Educational Planning. According to Fleming, initial plans had been made to include a Division of Adult Education.[111] However, this Division did not materialize until the following year.

The relevance of the establishment of O.I.S.E. to teacher education was phenomenal. It could be said to represent in this regard the aggrandizement of in-service education both on the vertical and the horizontal planes. It would provide to teachers in service the opportunity not only to achieve the highest academic preparation of their profession through its many program offerings, but also to avail themselves of its non-credit courses as well. But, most importantly, it would act as a resource agency for educational practitioners in the province by making available to them all its material resources and personnel to assist in finding solutions to the host of problems that confront them in their work in the field. As Jackson has stated,

> "We who helped establish the Institute envisaged a vital and productive union between the specialized competencies and rigorous methodologies of scholars, and the diverse skills and experience of practitioners. We planned a partnership that would yield abundant benefits to students, teachers, and school administrators both in Ontario and beyond its borders."[112]

9. Other Significant Changes and Developments

Several important changes took place at the elementary school level in Ontario. In 1956, the First Class Certificate was replaced by the Elementary School Teacher's Certificate. In 1957, applicants seeking admission to the one-year course leading to this certificate were required to have a standing in eight Grade 13 papers, including one in either English Literature or English Composition or an acceptable degree. However, the Department also accepted any of the following courses in place of the Grade 13 standing: the first year of studies offered at Assumption College, Carleton College, University of Ottawa, and University of Western Ontario; the preliminary year at McMaster University; the two year course in Childhood Management at the Ryerson Institute of Technology; the two-year course in Home Economics also at the Ryerson Institute of Technology; and the two-year course in Art Education for Prospective Teachers at the Ontario College of Art. Recognition of the last two qualifications was only given at Toronto Teachers' College. In 1958, the first year of studies (including a prescribed English course) offered at the University of Sudbury was added to this list. By 1962 the preliminary year at Waterloo University College was also added, while the preliminary year at McMaster and the first year at the University of Western Ontario and the two-year Art Education course at the Ontario College of Art were deleted.

Bilingual teacher training was during this period the special task of the University of Ottawa Teachers' College. It offered a one-year course leading to an Interim Second Class Certificate valid in bilingual schools. Applicants to this course were required to have a Secondary

School Graduation Diploma of the General course including a minimum of three options, one of which had to be either French Literature or French Composition. It also offered a Deferred Interim First Class Certificate course, which was discontinued in other teachers' colleges with the introduction of the emergency scheme of 1953. Admission to this course required standing in five Grade 13 papers, including one paper in English and another in French. The course was offered until the 1959-60 session, by which time it was referred to as the Deferred Interim Elementary-School Teacher's Certificate course. Thirdly, beginning in 1956, the Department introduced at the University of Ottawa Teachers' College a special three-summer in-service course for individuals who had taught in bilingual schools on letters of permission and were now interested in acquiring a Second Class Certificate. The program was similar to the two summer courses which, during the war, led to an Interim Second Class Certificate. Successful completion of the first summer session led to a Deferred Interim Second Class Certificate valid for one year in public and separate schools approved for the use of French as the language of instruction. Success in the second summer session led to an automatic renewal of the certificate, and completion of the third session led to an Interim Second Class Certificate valid for five years in bilingual schools. Its apparent unpopularity and a steady increase in the teacher supply caused the termination of the course at the end of the summer of 1962, with the completion of the third session of its second rotation.

The increase in the teacher supply also caused in 1959 an upward revision of the admission requirements to the two year-course and to

the pre-teachers' college summer course, offered in Toronto and Port Arthur. Candidates were now required to hold the Secondary School Graduation Diploma of the General course with at least four options instead of the previously demanded three.

In December, 1961 the Department of Education announced the introduction of a new plan for the certification of elementary school teachers.[113] The plan established four levels or "Standards" for the Elementary-School Teacher's Certificate. All students graduating from the one-year course offered at the teachers' colleges received a Standard 1 certificate. To receive a Standard 2 certificate a teacher had to earn credit in five university courses beyond the Grade 13 level, for which he was allowed to substitute credits earned by attending Departmental summer or winter courses. To acquire a Standard 3 certificate an individual must have credit in ten university courses, for which he could substitute not more than five Departmental courses. For a Standard 4 certificate the teacher had to have completed a Bachelor's degree from an Ontario university or any other degree approved by the Department. As Fleming points out in his Ontario's Educative Society, the new scheme "was designed to formalize recognition of in-service credits for university work and for departmental summer or equivalent winter courses",[114] and was viewed by the Department as "an incentive to elementary-school teachers to proceed in greater numbers to a university degree as well as to further professional education".[115] The plan also foreshadowed future trends in elementary school teacher education that would be facilitated to a great extent by the MacLeod Committee appointed in 1964.

An equally significant number of major changes in the admission and certification requirements affecting the secondary school level were made during the period. The apparently critical nature of the situation would prevent the introduction of any radical reform program.

In 1954-55 the Ordinary Vocational Certificate came to be known simply as the Interim Vocational Certificate, Type A and B. Although admission requirements remained the same for those entering the Type B course, candidates for the Type A program were required to have a degree in applied science with a minimum average of sixty-six per cent in their final and one other year, plus two years of work experience in their field of specialization. Furthermore, candidates in the program had to obtain a sixty-six per cent mark in all their Type B courses and follow additional courses in areas relating to the organization and administration of vocational schools.

In 1957, the Department of Education introduced an in-service scheme by which holders of Permanent High School Assistant's certificates or the Type B certificates could upgrade their qualifications to become eligible for the Type A Certificate. To accomplish this, teachers had still to obtain an honour degree or equivalent which now they could do by attending evening and summer courses. In an effort to provide the required personnel to teach subjects in the higher grades, in 1958 the Department introduced a system of "endorsement" by which teachers holding Permanent High School Assistant's or Type B certificates and possessing credits totalling half of the number required for the Type A Certificate (equalling five full-course credits) in an undergraduate subject were allowed to teach that subject. A similar

arrangement was also possible for teachers wishing to secure endorsement in two subjects. In this case, candidates had to show proof that they possessed in their undergraduate records a concentration of four courses in each subject area or a combination of five in one and three in another.

As the teacher shortage at the secondary school level became more acute in 1959, the Department relaxed its citizenship requirement. Now qualified teachers coming from abroad could obtain letters of standing by simply making a declaration of intention to become a Canadian citizen. In many cases, these teachers emigrated to Canada from other Commonwealth countries and were already British subjects.

In 1962, the reorganized program for secondary schools and the expansion of vocational education facilitated by the Federal-Provincial Technical and Vocational Training Agreement created a demand for more teachers capable of conducting technical, occupational training, and commercial courses. In response to this demand, in the summer of 1962 the Department offered a special five-week summer course leading to a Vocational Certificate valid for the teaching of certain commercial subjects. Applicants had to be holders of an acceptable certificate, diploma or degree qualifying them either as chartered accountants, certified general accountants, certified public accountants, graduates from the three-year course in Secretarial Science at an Ontario Institute of Technology, graduates of a three-year commercial course from a post-secondary institution of the United Kingdom, or graduates from accredited universities wishing to teach commercial subjects. In addition, applicants had to pass skill tests and obtain a position

with a school board to teach a vocational subject for which no legally qualified person had been found.

To boost further the supply of vocational teachers, the Department also made provision to allow candidates attending during the regular session at O.C.E. and those following the initial eight-week instalment of the emergency summer course at Toronto, London and Kingston to take commercial subjects as one of their three teaching options.

The 1962 Minister's Report recounts that 50 students were admitted into the special five-week summer course, 320 teachers holding High School Assistant's certificates attended summer courses in order to complete their commercial certificate requirements, and 150 students selected commercial subjects as one of their options of teaching subjects.[116] Over the years, these steps taken to improve the supply of vocational teachers did prove to be successful.

In 1965, the Department extended the jurisdiction of certificates as a means of encouraging the mobility of teachers from one level to another within the system. The extension of jurisdiction granted to a holder of a Permanent Elementary-School Teacher's Certificate, Standard 4, upon accepting a contract to teach in a secondary school, an Interim High-School Assistant's Certificate, Type B. Similarly, a holder of a Permanent High-School Assistant's Certificate was granted an Interim Elementary-School Teacher's Certificate, Standard 4, upon accepting a contract to teach in an elementary school. The Department expected that most of these transfers would occur in the range of Grades 7 to 10. Those teachers accepting positions in grades outside

this range were asked to seek the advice of the Teacher Education Branch regarding how best to prepare in adjusting to their new teaching duties.

1965 was a special year for the Teacher Education Branch, which up until that time was exclusively concerned with the supervision of the teachers' colleges. However, as a result of a reorganization of the Department, the Branch was given additional responsibilities. Thereafter, the Teacher Education Branch was responsible for the supervision of the training and professional development of elementary school teachers, for the maintenance of close liaison with the newly established Althouse College in London and, of course, O.C.E., and for the summer courses program offered for secondary school teachers.

In the early 1960's, there was no doubt that the majority of teachers and normal school staffs alike saw the establishment of closer ties between teacher training institutions and universities as a most desirable means of bringing about reform and improvement in the profession. However, no reciprocal overtures had been made by the universities themselves, nor had they over the years expressed interest in the education of elementary school teachers. But in 1963 the situation changed. Dr. John Saywell, Dean of Arts and Science at the recently founded York University, proposed that the University introduce a degree program for both elementary and secondary school teachers.[117] The program would be conducted concurrently with the regular academic curriculum of the University and would guarantee full participation to personnel from the school system in the training

of the new teachers. By the end of 1964, interest in the Saywell proposal had grown substantially enough to cause the Academic Planning and Policy Committee of the University to appoint a sub-committee on teacher training. The committee was chaired by Saywell and would make an attempt "to investigate present discontent with the whole preparation of High School and Elementary teachers by the university, the normal school, and O.C.E.".[118]

It was also during this same time that Davis appointed the MacLeod Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers. Shortly after its formation the Committee expressed interest in hearing from the York sub-committee. The sub-committee responded positively to the MacLeod Committee's invitation by presenting its proposal in May, 1965 entitled "York University and the Preparation of Teachers". In October, 1965, the sub-committee presented its brief to the York University Senate for its approval. The York model did not differ greatly from that presented by Group 18 in the Staff Conference Report, which was discussed earlier. The York model called for a concurrent program of teacher education to be offered in the Faculty of Arts and Science, which would exercise complete control over admissions and the maintenance of academic standards. The model thus ruled out the establishment of a faculty of education, an omission which was not received favourably by the MacLeod Committee. It also called for greater involvement on the part of the local schools, especially in the areas of observation, practice teaching, and seminars which would be conducted by "master teachers" or "adjunct professors" cross-appointed from the schools to the University.

The Saywell proposal was unanimously approved by the York University

Senate. However, the conditions were not yet ripe to allow its implementation. Moreover, by the time implementation did take place in 1970, the York model had undergone essential revision to accommodate the views of Department of Education officials. And so in 1970, York University had its own Faculty of Education.

Two very important developments of the period under consideration were the appointment of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers and the Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario. The former was appointed by Davis himself on September 25, 1964, and the latter was called into being by an Order-in-Council dated the 10th day of June, 1965. The Minister's Committee, chaired by R.A. MacLeod, then Director of Education in Niagara Falls, produced its seventy-page report with its forty-seven recommendations early in 1966. The Department of Education's response to these recommendations was immediate and the MacLeod Report was instrumental in effecting the kinds of change in teacher education that were necessary for the times. The Committee on Aims and Objectives, co-chaired by the Honourable E.M. Hall, then Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, and Mr. Lloyd Dennis, a former school principal, released its monumental report entitled Living and Learning in 1968. In contrast to the Minister's Committee whose terms of reference were limited to an assessment of the elementary teacher training program in the province, those of the Committee on Aims and Objectives were more encompassing -- "'to set forth the aims of education for the educational system of the Province' and to propose means by which these aims could be achieved".[119] It is within this broad context

that the Committee treated teacher education. The Committee made a grand total of two hundred and fifty-one(251) recommendations touching practically all parts of the educational system and, in particular, endorsed all the recommendations made by the Minister's Committee regarding teacher education. Its own impact on teacher education was felt much more in the area of curriculum planning than in the actual structural development of the teachers' training institutions. Its effect on educational developments in Ontario has not been fully assessed, but one can safely say that it has been extensive -- though not as substantial, perhaps, as it may be when more favourable socio-economic conditions permit the full implementation of its recommended programs.

10. The Ideal Teacher and Teacher Education

The call for higher standards in teacher education has been loudest in times of crisis -- during periods when political expediency dictated courses of action which appeared either to militate against qualitative changes or at least to decelerate the process of achieving them. This was undoubtedly true of the era under consideration. This demand for improvement in teacher education can be equally documented through the conception of the teacher and teacher education that prevailed and was given expression in some of the more pertinent educational reports released during this period.

For the members of the Hope Royal Commission the fundamental aim of education was not simply to transmit to the student an organized body of knowledge which he would acquire, retain and regurgitate at

examination time. For them, education was more than that. It was also for the purpose of helping the student "recognize subtle differences, to develop responsibility, and keen and abiding interests and desirable attitudes".[120] Such a task required flexible and comprehensive teaching methods that would assist the student in achieving all these objectives. The task could only be carried out by an individual who possessed high personal and academic qualifications, "prepared for his profession by a broad education which gives him the resources of educational philosophy and psychology and of much general knowledge and experience, and so enables him to understand the newer methods and to devise procedures suitable for particular purposes and circumstances".[121]

Under the category of personal qualifications, the Commissioners included the following qualities: high standard of physical and mental health, superior intelligence, a deep and abiding religious faith, a mature and stable personality, and a willingness and ability to fraternize and co-operate with his fellows.[122] Simply put, the Commissioners visualized an all-round person -- the ideal teacher whose qualities would be restated, elaborated, and refined further by others throughout this period.

The Commissioners' view of the ideal teacher was naturally reflected in their philosophy of teacher training. Professional training would constitute one step in the realization of this ideal. The major responsibility would rest with the individual who through deep and genuine dedication to his work would over the years develop and come to full maturation as a teacher. However, while in teacher training the individual would come to realize the general aims of education,

become acquainted with both developmental and educational psychology, acquire a sound knowledge of pedagogical skills and practices, and learn organizational methods of class preparation.[123] Thus, the teacher education program would assist the individual in applying his background to the activity of teaching and provide him with the theoretical and practical rudiments of educational knowledge on which to build a successful and fulfilling career.[124]

As a way of ensuring the selection of ideal candidates to the profession, the Commissioners recommended in their Interim Report, 1949, the establishment of a selection committee at each normal school.[125] The setting up of a similar selection committee, and for the same motive, was recommended in the O.P.S.M.T.F.'s Report.[126] This selection committee would assess the eligibility of each prospective candidate on the following qualities: academic ability, industry, leadership, dependability, appearance, voice, oral English, poise, maturity, enthusiasm, and any other qualities which the committee determined as significant.[127]

The emphasis of the Patten Committee was on competence and educational leadership. "The teacher (referring specifically to the secondary school teacher) is a participating, creative, responsible person who must be skilled in the complexities and subtleties of the educational processes in a democratic society."[128] Such an individual possessed proven scholarship ability, if he was in the academic field, or excellent technical skills, if he was in the vocational field. In addition, the Committee members did not feel it was unreasonable to expect of such a person to have "a sense of calling and an ideal

of self-sacrifice".[129]

If the teacher was to emulate the kind of leadership role in the classroom that the Committee proposed for education in general in relationship to society, then such a person should possess a very mature understanding of the nature of society and the workings of the democratic process. This individual would be able to create in his classroom the kinds of conditions necessary to assist the students in participating more fully in the democratic life of their society. "Society has a right", the Committee stated, "to expect the schools to carry its ideals forward to the young, and to expect the good teacher to be perceptive of these ideals and to be prepared to work toward them in the classroom."[130]

The teacher education course (formulated along a consecutive plan) put forward by the Committee would have as its prime objective the placement of individuals possessing these high qualities into the classrooms of the province. The Committee felt that O.C.E. and the newer colleges of education could accomplish this task not only by setting up carefully scrutinized screening mechanisms for new candidates but by assuming for themselves a leadership role in effecting educational change in the province.[131]

The Committee proposed similar qualities that the ideal teacher should possess as those propounded by earlier studies. The value of this kind of exercise was that it provided to those concerned with assessment and certification a useful yardstick by which to 'rule out' undesirable candidates from the profession. At the same time it seems to have had the subtle and negative effect of creating a fixed

stereotype of the teacher which, in turn, has acted upon the individual teacher and the profession as a whole, perhaps in a latent and subliminal sort of way, to make teachers self-complacent and intransigent to external influences. Perhaps this is an inescapable consequence which results when a group of people performing a similar function becomes an institution. If this is so, what should be expected of teachers is not external conformity to a set of ideals, but the development of the capacity to be self-critical and critical of the system within which they labour so as to offset this pernicious tendency.

No new concepts of the teacher or teacher education would be put forward before the close of the period under consideration. The MacLeod Report devoted two whole pages to "The Role of the Teacher".[132] It also stressed the leadership role of the teacher -- in this case the elementary school teacher -- and placed less emphasis, at least in this section of the report, on the academic background of the teacher. In general, it summarized long-accepted credentials required of prospective candidates to the profession, as its recommendations concerning teacher education loudly echoed the innumerable cries of commissioners and educators at large who saw much room for improvement in teacher education. Finally, in one last paragraph ending the two-page exposition on the role of the teacher, the MacLeod Report reassured its readership -- predominantly teachers, no doubt -- of their own self-worth and importance:

> "The work of the teacher is of supreme importance -- important to the children entrusted to his care, important to the community in which he lives and works, and important to the nation of which he is a respected citizen. To the children the teacher is the person who holds the key that opens the door to knowledge, understanding, and wisdom. To the community he is the person to whom parents have entrusted the education of their children. To the nation he is the person who, together with the home and the church, is responsible for developing in the children that knowledge and those skills and attitudes which will enable them to become effective citizens in our democracy."[133]

In the next decade (1966-76) every conceivable opportunity in both material and human resources would be provided to assist the teacher in meeting the high standards called for during the preceding fifteen years. The majority of teachers would be successful in becoming highly specialized and qualified practitioners (See figures for Ontario in Tables 6-8). Whether or not these same teachers came closer to fulfilling the ideal is (and perhaps will always be) difficult to determine with any degree of certitude. Nevertheless, despite the overwhelming improvement in the academic and professional preparation of teachers, and despite the unprecedented expansion that would occur at all levels of the system, one would still hear demands expressed both within the system and from the public sector for <u>better teachers</u> and <u>better teacher education.</u>

TABLE 6

Classification of Teachers in All Publicly-Controlled Schools According to Certificate, 1950

No.		Newfoundland — Terre-Neuve			Prince Edward Island — Île du Prince-Édouard			Nova Scotia — Nouvelle-Écosse			New Brunswick[1] — Nouveau-Brunswick[1]			Ontario		
		M.	F.	T.	M.	F.	T.	M.	F.	T.	M.	F.	T.	M.	F.	T.
	Certificates:															
1	Academic	29	28	57	—	—	—	331	402	733	58	70	128	2,656	1,630	4,286
2	Class I	182	97	279	69	194	263	187	1,145	1,332	285	1,505	1,790	3,246	10,091	13,337
3	Class II	226	479	705	40	310	350	124	1,100	1,224	40	694	734	348	3,685	4,033
4	Class III	224	705	929	4	25	29	27	452	479	12	109	121	10	49	59
5	Special	—	—	—	1	1	2	—	—	—	73	49	122	857	1,256	2,113
6	Permit	150	245	395	12	46	58	56	455	511	99	482	581	279	1,021	1,300
7	Unspecified	1	9	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—
8	Total	812	1,563	2,375	126	585	711	725	3,534	4,279	567	2,910	3,477	7,396	17,732	25,128
9	University graduates	29	28	57	18	7	25	4	4	4	171	148	319	3,696	2,269	5,965

Source: DBS, Teachers' Salaries and Qualifications in Nine Provinces, 1950.

TABLE 7

Certificates – All Teachers and Principals, Eight Provinces, 1965-66

No.	Certificates *	Newfoundland — Terre-Neuve			Prince Edward Island — Île-du-Prince-Édouard			Nova Scotia — Nouvelle-Écosse			New Brunswick — Nouveau-Brunswick			Ontario		
		M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
		All elementary[1] teachers and principals														
1	Level 7	1	1	2	...	...	...	—	—	—	—	—	—	...	...	...
2	" 6	8	6	14	...	...	...	41	41	82	43	37	80	...	...	...
3	" 5	40	23	63	14	10	24	158	499	657	66	142	208	1,735	560	2,295
4	" 4	75	79	154	4	7	11	79	285	364	27	137	164	...	...	...
5	" 3	90	74	164	4	42	46	81	662	743	138	699	837	2	282	284
6	" 2	152	316	468	31	123	154	111	1,958	2,069	63	976	1,039	9,447	28,720	38,197
7	" 1	331	1,421	1,752	28	402	430	32	868	900	66	1,373	1,439	384	2,937	3,321
8	" 0	507	1,204	1,711	15	227	242	28	502	530	50	758	808	214	381	595
9	Special	—	—	—	2	—	2	—	2	2	—	—	—	20	39	59
10	Unclassified	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	27	86	113
11	Total	1,204	3,124	4,328	98	811	909	530	4,817	5,347	453	4,122	4,575	11,859	33,005	44,864
		All secondary[1] teachers and principals														
12	Level 7	15	8	23	...	...	...	1	2	3	...	...	...	...	...	...
13	" 6	39	16	55	...	...	...	294	144	438	345	148	493	3,641	1,351	4,992
14	" 5	155	40	195	54	41	95	605	485	1,090	333	233	566	6,110	3,387	9,497
15	" 4	226	71	297	18	18	36	125	162	287	93	76	169	...	...	...
16	" 3	106	58	164	16	15	31	114	151	265	184	225	409	...	...	...
17	" 2	146	77	223	17	46	63	52	162	214	128	147	275	2,364	655	3,019
18	" 1	120	100	220	13	35	48	14	41	55	107	140	247	—	—	—
19	" 0	22	16	38	15	5	20	61	48	109	37	18	55	2,092	1,328	3,420
20	Special	2	—	2	7	—	7	71	18	89	12	11	23	170	95	265
21	Unclassified	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	63	44	107
22	Total	831	386	1,217	140	160	300	1,337	1,213	2,550	1,239	998	2,237	14,440	6,860	21,300

Source: DBS, Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1965-66.

*The classification of certificates into levels by DBS was based on the number of years of academic preparation and professional training required beyond the junior matriculation level. Thus, for example, a teacher who had four years of academic preparation beyond Grade 12 plus one year of teacher training would be placed under level 5, the equivalent of five years beyond his junior matriculation year.

TABLE 8

All Teachers and Principals by Highest University Degree, Eight Provinces, 1965-66

Tous instituteurs et directeurs avec un degré universitaire, huit provinces, 1965-66

Province and teaching level — Province et niveau d'enseignement	Doctor — Doctorat			Master — Maîtrise			Bachelor — Baccalauréat			Total			
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T	Percentage[1] — Pourcentage[1]
Newfoundland – Terre-Neuve:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	–	–	–	12	6	18	110	93	203	122	99	221	5.1
Secondary – Secondaires	1	–	1	51	26	77	363	114	477	415	140	555	45.6
Total	1	–	1	63	32	95	473	207	680	537	239	776	14.0
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.0	–	0.0	3.1	0.9	1.7	23.2	5.9	12.3	26.4	6.8	14.0	
Prince Edward Island – Île-du-Prince-Édouard:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	–	–	–	–	–	–	15	8	23	15	8	23	2.5
Secondary – Secondaires	–	–	–	2	5	7	69	47	116	71	52	123	41.0
Total	–	–	–	2	5	7	84	55	139	86	60	146	12.1
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	–	–	–	0.8	0.5	0.6	35.3	5.7	11.5	36.1	6.2	12.1	
Nova Scotia – Nouvelle-Écosse:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	–	–	–	36	35	71	184	541	725	220	576	796	14.9
Secondary – Secondaires	3	1	4	231	130	361	661	551	1,212	895	682	1,577	61.8
Total	3	1	4	267	165	432	845	1,092	1,937	1,115	1,258	2,373	30.0
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.2	0.0	0.1	14.3	2.7	5.5	45.3	18.1	24.5	59.7	20.9	30.0	
New Brunswick – Nouveau-Brunswick:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	–	–	–	7	5	12	103	164	267	110	169	279	6.1
Secondary – Secondaires	1	–	1	70	38	108	612	356	968	683	394	1,077	48.1
Total	1	–	1	77	43	120	715	520	1,235	793	563	1,356	19.9
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.1	–	0.0	4.6	0.8	1.8	42.3	10.2	18.1	46.9	11.0	19.9	
Ontario:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	3	3	6	393	142	535	2,443	2,006	4,449	2,839	2,151	4,990	11.1
Secondary – Secondaires	56	8	64	1,121	346	1,467	10,333	5,437	15,770	11,510	5,791	17,301	81.2
Total	59	11	70	1,514	488	2,002	12,776	7,443	20,219	14,349	7,942	22,291	33.7
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.2	0.0	0.1	5.8	1.2	3.0	48.6	18.7	30.6	54.6	19.9	33.7	
Manitoba:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	–	–	–	32	16	48	199	303	502	231	319	550	9.0
Secondary – Secondaires	5	–	5	141	65	206	1,250	697	1,947	1,396	762	2,158	68.7
Total	5	–	5	173	81	254	1,449	1,000	2,449	1,627	1,081	2,709	29.3
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.1	–	0.1	5.1	1.4	2.8	43.1	17.0	26.5	48.4	18.4	29.3	
Saskatchewan:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Secondary – Secondaires	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs													
Alberta:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	1	2	3	64	29	93	747	888	1,635	812	919	1,731	18.9
Secondary – Secondaires	12	2	14	375	100	475	2,529	1,217	3,746	2,916	1,319	4,235	66.7
Total	13	4	17	439	129	568	3,276	2,105	5,381	3,728	2,238	5,966	38.4
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.2	0.0	0.1	7.7	1.3	3.7	57.2	21.5	34.7	65.1	22.9	38.4	
British Columbia – Colombie-Britannique:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	–	–	–	71	20	91	937	997	1,934	1,008	1,017	2,025	22.5
Secondary – Secondaires	9	1	10	416	136	552	2,957	1,423	4,380	3,382	1,560	4,942	73.3
Total	9	1	10	487	156	643	3,894	2,420	6,314	4,390	2,577	6,967	44.2
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.1	0.0	0.1	7.1	1.8	4.1	56.6	27.3	40.1	63.8	29.0	44.2	
8 provinces:													
Elementary – Élémentaires	4	5	9	615	253	868	4,738	5,000	9,738	5,357	5,258	10,615	12.6
Secondary – Secondaires	87	12	99	2,407	846	3,253	18,774	9,842	28,616	21,268	10,700	31,968	72.9
Total	91	17	108	3,022	1,099	4,121	23,512	14,842	38,354	26,625	15,958	42,583	33.2
As percentage of all teachers – Pourcentage de tous les instituteurs	0.2	0.0	0.1	6.3	1.4	3.2	48.9	18.5	29.9	55.4	19.9	33.2	

Source: DBS, Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1965-66.

[1] Percentage of all teachers.

Notes

1. Carlyn F. Goulson, "An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education," an Ed.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1966, p. 379.

2. Ontario. Royal Commission on Education, Report, Toronto: King's Printer, 1950, pp. 600-610.

3. Ibid., p. 606.

4. Ibid., pp. 607-608.

5. Ibid., pp. 579-580.

6. Ibid., p. 577.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p. 579.

10. Ontario Normal School Teachers' Association, A Report on the Normal Schools of the Province of Ontario, by a committee of the Association, Toronto, 1950, p.4.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., p. 5.

13. Ibid., p. 11.

14. Ibid., p. 80.

15. See p. 65.

16. Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation, A Programme for Teacher Education in Ontario, by a committee of the Federation, Toronto, 1950, p. 4.

17. Ibid., pp. 4-5.

18. Ibid., p. 14.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., p. 18.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., pp. 15-16.

24. Ibid., pp. 17-18.

25. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1952, p. 11.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid.

29. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1953, p. 14.

30. Ibid.

31. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1954, p. 13.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. Ibid.

35. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1955, p. 6.

36. Ibid.

37. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1956, p. 7.

38. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1957, p. 6.

39. Quoted in W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society / Vol. V: Supporting Institutions and Services, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971, p. 128.

40. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1968, p. 20.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Ibid.

44. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1957, p. 8.

45. Ibid.

46. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/ Vol. VII: Educational Contributions of Associations, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972, p. 68.

47. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. V: Supporting Institutions and Services, p. 149.

48. Ibid., p. 150.

49. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. VII: Educational Contributions of Associations, pp. 59-60.

50. Ibid., p. 60.

51. See pp.109-113 for a treatment of the relevance of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education to this field.

52. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1965, p. 88, Table 2.5.

53. Ontario. Department of Education, Memoranda 1964-65, No. 46.

54. Ontario. Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers, Toronto, 1962, p. 5.

55. Ibid., p. 13.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid.

58. Ibid., p. 16.

59. Ibid.

60. Ibid., p. 19.

61. Ibid., p. 20.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid., p. 21.

64. Ibid., pp. 21-22.

65. Ibid., p. 30.

66. Ibid., p. 31.

67. Ibid.

68. Ibid., p. 49.

69. Ibid., p. 50.

70. Ibid.

71. Ibid., pp. 53-54; Cf. Ontario. Royal Commission on Education, Report, p. 585, fn. 1.

72. Ibid., p. 54.

73. Ibid., pp. 54-55.

74. Ibid., p. 61.

75. Ibid., p. 56.

76. Ibid., p. 210.

77. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol.V: Supporting Institutions and Services, p. 87.

78. Ibid.

79. Ontario Teachers' College Association, Suggested Changes in the One-Year Course at the Ontario Teachers' Colleges, report of the staff conference held at Toronto Teachers' College, April 1-2, 1964, p. 1.

80. Ibid.

81. Ibid., p. 2.

82. Ibid., p. 58.

83. Ibid.

84. Ibid.

85. Ibid.

86. Ibid., p. 59.

87. Ibid., p. 61.

88. Ibid.

89. Ibid.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid

92. Ibid., p. 62.

93. Ibid., p. 64.

94. Ibid.

95. Ibid.

96. Ibid., p. 65. Cf. Great Britain. Committee on Higher Education (chaired by Lord Robbins) 1961-63, Report, London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963, pp. 107-125; National Education Association of the United States. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Bowling Green Conference Report, The Education of Teachers. New Perspectives, 1958, 399p.

97. Ibid.

98. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. V: Supporting Institutions and Services, p. 208.

99. Ibid.

100. Ibid.

101. Ibid.

102. Ibid., p. 209.

103. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, First Annual Report of the Board of Governors 1965-66, Toronto, 1966, p. 6.

104. Ibid.

105. Ibid.

106. Ibid.

107. Ibid.

108. Ibid.

109. Ibid., p. 5.

110. Ibid.

111. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. V: Supporting Institutions and Services, p. 227.

112. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Report of the Director 1967/68, Toronto, 1969, p. 4, c.1.

113. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1961, p. 7.

114. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. V: Supporting Institutions and Services, p. 12.

115. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1961, p. 7.

116. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Year 1962, p. 7.

117. Sheila M. Dutton, "The Development of the Faculty of Education at York University 1965-1972," an unpublished paper, the University of Toronto Higher Education Group, 1973, p. 5.

118. Ibid., pp. 5-6.

119. Ontario. Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, Report, Living and Learning, Toronto: Newton Publishing Co., 1968, p. 4, c.3.

120. Ontario. Royal Commission on Education, Report, p. 34.

121. Ibid.

122. Ibid., p. 564.

123. Ibid., p. 565.

124. Ibid., p. 564.

125. Ibid.

126. Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation, A Programme for Teacher Education in Ontario, p. 22.

127. Ibid.

128. Ontario. Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers, p. 17.

129. Ibid.

130. Ibid., p. 18.

131. Ibid., p. 16.

132. Ontario. Department of Education, Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, Report, Toronto, 1966, pp. 9-10.

133. Ibid., p. 10.

Part IV

A DECADE OF TRANSITION AND CHANGE: 1966-1976

A. Background

One of the overriding principles that has governed policy development regarding teacher education in Ontario has been that of supply and demand. The teacher shortage which had dominated the post-World War II period began to be alleviated in the early 1960's. However, the period from the mid 60's to the early 70's saw a dramatic shift in the supply and demand cycle. Following the rapid growth of the previous two decades, the total enrolment in Ontario elementary and secondary schools peaked at just over two million in 1971-1972. The decline in school enrolments has brought in its wake an uneven demand for physical facilities and a need for fewer teachers. Thus, within less than a decade, the deficit of adequately qualified teachers shifted to a surplus of adequately qualified teachers without a sustained intervening period where the supply met the demand.[1]

The major documents which influenced policy developments in teacher education in the decade were the MacLeod Report (1966) and the Hall-Dennis Report (1968). Although there was a significant expansion in the number of institutions training secondary school teachers and the summer emergency training programs were discontinued, the major transformation in teacher education during this period occurred in the training of elementary teachers. The responsibility for training elementary teachers was transferred for the most part to faculties of education within universities from government-operated teachers' colleges. Likewise, the academic prerequisites for admission of prospective candidates to teacher training were raised from Grade 12 or 13 certification

to an acceptable university degree.

Until the mid sixties teacher education in Ontario was highly centralized. The calendar of the teachers' colleges was prepared in the Department of Education and therefore all the programs offered by the thirteen Department-operated teachers' colleges were virtually the same.

However, with the increase in the number of colleges and faculties of education, the emergence of open area schools and the issuance of curriculum guidelines rather than courses of study by the Ministry of Education, decentralization of responsibility for teacher education became necessary and desirable. The responsibility for designing teacher education programs now rests with the deans or principals and their staffs working in co-operation with local teachers. However, the Ministry of Education has retained some indirect control over program development by retaining control of teacher certification. In principle, the Minister of Education could refuse certification to those students graduating from programs the Ministry deemed inadequate for teacher preparation. In fact, no such problem has arisen to date between faculties of education and the Ministry. The degree of co-operation that has developed between the faculties of education and the Ministry is evidenced in the announcement of the Minister, Thomas Wells, in his 1975-76 fiscal report that an agreement had been reached between the Ministry and the Council of Ontario Universities concerning the cyclical review of teacher education programs.[2]

B. The MacLeod Report

In the early 1960's there was growing concern about the development of elementary school teachers. Many felt that one professional year following Grade 13 was an inadequate background for a professional teacher. Many felt that the centralized control of the teachers' colleges inhibited innovations in teacher education. As a consequence, the Minister of Education, William Davis, appointed in 1964 a committee, chaired by C.R. MacLeod, to examine and report on the training of elementary school teachers in Ontario. The Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, as it came to be called, was given the following specific terms of reference:

"1. to examine the teacher-training program now being followed at the Ontario Teachers' Colleges;
2. to examine other selected teacher-training programs;
3. to recommend changes that might be made immediately to improve the present One-year Course;
4. to develop, in some detail, what the committee considers to be an ideal program for the training of teachers for the elementary schools of Ontario;
5. to suggest the successive steps that might be taken, over a period of time, to achieve the implementation of this ideal program."[3]

The Committee also received assurances from the Minister that it was within its mandate to undertake an examination of all aspects of elementary school teacher education and consider the possibility of integrating the elementary and secondary school teacher-education programs. During its two-year study, the Committee met forty-nine times and considered ninety-nine briefs by individuals and organizations.

Two years after receiving its mandate, the Committee brought down

its report. The Committee delineated the problem of elementary teacher education primarily in terms of the academic background and maturity of the student teacher candidates. The authors claimed that the importance of the teacher's role in society was not fully recognized, nor was the scholastic and professional training required to prepare him for that role fully acknowledged. They said that "most graduates from our Teachers' Colleges are too young, too immature, and less well prepared academically than they should be."[4] Although the Committee commented on several aspects of the problem of teacher education as they perceived it -- e.g., central control by the Department of Education resulting in a rigidity of program, inadequate physical facilities to accommodate flexibility in programming, lack of recognition of the importance of associate teachers, etc. -- the Committee characterized the central problem of teacher education as being one of "inadequate academic education and insufficient maturity on the part of the student teacher".[5]

In light of how the Committee conceptualized the problem of teacher education, it is understandable that they unanimously recommended:

1. that teacher education should be provided by the university;
2. that the program should be of four years' duration leading to a baccalaureate degree and professional certification; and
3. that elementary and secondary school teacher education should be offered within the same university faculty or college where feasible.[6]

They also agreed that the four main components in teacher education

ought to be:

1. a liberal or academic education;
2. foundations of education such as psychology, philosophy and sociology which they believed elementary and secondary school teachers could profitably study together;
3. curriculum and instruction;
4. practice teaching.[7]

The report recommended that there should be different routes to certification, including an internship plan, a concurrent plan and a consecutive plan. The concurrent plan was to be a four-year program in which academic courses and professional preparation would be taken together. The Committee believed that those students who knew that they wished to become teachers when they graduated from secondary school would benefit from the experience of a protracted academic and professional education in the stimulating environment of a university. The Committee also recommended that a one-year professional training program be available for those who completed their formal academic training before deciding to become teachers. The internship plan was considered to be a supplementary program for mature candidates with special talents and was to be designed co-operatively by school boards and the Department of Education. The authors recognized that it would take considerable time and reorganization to implement their recommendations and consequently they outlined a series of steps for phasing in the proposed changes.

The Minister of Education, William Davis, accepted the recommendations of the MacLeod Committee enthusiastically and committed the Department of Education to implementing the program suggestions as

quickly as possible. Some of the recommendations, particularly those concerning improvement of the existing one-year course, were acted upon immediately. Other recommendations, particularly those that required negotiations with the universities, were phased in over a period of several years. However, by 1973 a substantial portion of the MacLeod Report had been implemented.

The internship program was instituted for only a short period of time. The program consisted of three phases -- a summer course of professional study, one year of observation and teaching, and a second summer of professional study. The interns were salaried for the year of observation and teaching in the schools and received supervision from board personnel and college staff. During its operation the internship program graduated approximately fifty students a year. Advocates of the program believed that the mature individual could learn to teach most effectively by being involved in the practical aspects of teaching. Critics of the program argued that the sustained experience in the classroom setting would tend to reinforce traditional practices and that the classroom teachers who were largely responsible for the interns' training often had neither the time, inclination nor special skills required for the task. The program was discontinued because it was found to be an expensive way to train teachers, both from a financial and a personnel point of view, and because sufficient numbers of candidates were presenting themselves for training at the teachers' colleges.

The MacLeod Report can be seen as a logical outcome of the

struggle to professionalize and upgrade the qualifications of teachers. By 1973 many of the major recommendations in the report had been implemented. The major focus of the MacLeod Committee had been on the academic background and immaturity of the student teachers and when the appropriate conditions prevailed the Ministry of Education raised the admission requirements for teacher education where English was the language of instruction to an acceptable university degree. The majority of existing teachers' colleges had been integrated into universities, two teachers' colleges had been closed and in 1974 only Toronto Teachers' College and Hamilton Teachers' College remained under direct control of the Ministry of Education. Concurrent and consecutive programs were available for student teachers and the internship program had been implemented for a few years. Seven years after the MacLeod Committee had brought down its report, it could be seen that the recommendations it contained had had a significant impact on the development of teacher education in the province.

C. The Integration of Teachers' Colleges and Universities

The transfer of the teachers' colleges into the university system was one of the thorniest problems. Most universities showed a willingness to establish faculties of education. Some created major planning committees to develop proposals for faculties -- proposals which were frequently ignored for long periods, or modified by negotiation, or found unacceptable by the Ministry of Education. Some of the problems included a reluctance by universities to accept the staffs of the teachers' colleges, a concern by the Ministry for the careers of teachers' college staff members who were civil servants, a fear by the Ministry that university autonomy would reduce Ministry input into the processes of teacher education, a strong local political pressure against the closing of any teachers' college, a reluctance of the University of Toronto to take on the Toronto Teachers' College and competing claims by different cities to be centres of teacher education.

Years of tortuous negotiations ensued in which political opportunism played a considerable part. After many months of discussions, during which the Council of Presidents of Universities (C.P.U.) became involved in the issue, the "Deutsch" guidelines for the transfer of teachers' college staffs into universities were worked out.* The teachers' college staff members were to have their positions guaranteed for four years, during which time they could demonstrate their teaching competence in the university setting and they would be encouraged to improve their

---

*Thus named after John Deutsch, chairman of the C.P.U. subcommittee that produced the guidelines.

academic qualifications by taking advantage of the funds the Department of Education promised to make available for this purpose.

The integration of the teachers' colleges into the universities began in 1969 when the Lakehead Teachers' College became the Faculty of Education of Lakehead University and the University of Ottawa Teachers' College became part of the University of Ottawa's Faculty of Education. In 1970, Windsor Teachers' College was integrated with the University of Windsor; and in 1971, St. Catharines Teachers' College was integrated with Brock University and Lakeshore Teachers' College with York University.

Between 1969 and 1973 the admission requirements for entrance into a teacher training program were raised progressively. In fact, the Ministry of Education phased in the first degree requirement for certification in fewer stages than the MacLeod Report recommended. In 1973, when an acceptable university degree was required of all students seeking admission to the teaching profession at the elementary level, projected enrolments for the teachers' colleges dropped to the point where it became evident that not all teachers' colleges would be needed in future years. Consequently, the Ministry of Education closed Peterborough Teachers' College in August 1973 and the Faculty of Education at Queen's University absorbed the Peterborough Teachers' College staff and assumed responsibility for elementary teacher training in that part of the province. Stratford Teachers' College was also closed and the majority if its academic staff were transferred to Toronto Teachers' College. In the same year North Bay Teachers' College was

integrated with Nipissing University College and London Teachers' College with the University of Western Ontario.

In 1974, Sudbury Teachers' College was integrated with Laurentian University and Ottawa Teachers' College became a part of the Faculty of Education, University of Ottawa; the latter Faculty became the only one in the province responsible for the preparation of both English-speaking and French-speaking elementary teachers.

Many of the teachers' colleges had been small-scale in their operation. It was understandable that when a university took over one of these institutions it tended to expand the operation to make the faculty economically viable in the light of the more sophisticated programs and the resulting specialization in staff. Institutions which had, as teachers' colleges, been responsible for elementary programs tended now under university direction to move into secondary certification as well as graduate studies under the policy recommendations of the MacLeod Report. Institutions which had begun as secondary teacher training institutions moved into the elementary field, either with full programs or expanded elementary options. The development of the university faculties of education had the effect of greatly expanding the teacher education capacity of the province. Many people in the universities responsible for the overall planning were concerned as the process developed that, unless several colleges were phased out and the number of faculties limited, there was a real danger that in transferring each college into a university faculty there would be a significant overdevelopment of teacher education places in the province. In fact, such a pattern of overdevelopment had emerged by 1975.

D. Living and Learning on Teacher Education

The other major report that profoundly affected elementary school programs and elementary teacher training in the decade was the report of the Provincial Committee on the Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, Living and Learning or the "Hall-Dennis Report", as it came to be known. W.G. Fleming asserted that Living and Learning may be "the most important educational document ever produced in Ontario".[8] In some ways the report can be seen as a synthesis of progressivist educational philosophy in the tradition of Dewey, Pestalozzi and Froebel, although it did not advocate the particular philosophy of any one educator. The report was not without its critics. However, the political, economic and social climate of the time was ripe for the report to get widespread media coverage and some popular support. Probably one of the more important results of the report was that it stimulated serious discussion on the nature of schooling in our society.

The Order-in-Council of June 10, 1965 mandated the Committee to:

> "- identify the needs of the child as a person and as a member of society
> - set forth the aims of education for the educational system of the Province
> - outline objectives of the curriculum for children in the age groups presently designated as Kindergarten, Primary and Junior Divisions
> - propose means by which these aims and objectives may be achieved
> - submit a report for the consideration of the Minister of Education."[9]

The Committee received a total of 112 briefs, sent teams to study other educational systems and sought the opinions of researchers and

various educational personnel. The report was published in June 1968 and the Minister reported that there was an unexpectedly heavy demand for copies of the report and that over 100,000 copies of either the full or the abridged report were printed for distribution. The report included 258 recommendations which the Committee stated would support its two fundamental recommendations, namely, to:

> "establish, as fundamental principles governing school education in Ontario,
>
> (a) the right of every individual to have equal access to the learning experience best suited to his needs, and
>
> (b) the responsibility of every school authority to provide a child-centred learning continuum that invites learning by individual discovery and inquiry."[10]

The report emphasized the rights and dignity of the individual child. The style and tone of the document were optimistic and reflected the expanded expectations that developed during the sixties of education being a panacea for society's social, political and economic problems.

The elementary school educational policy of the Ontario Government is explicated in Education in the Primary and Junior Division (1975) and The Formative Years (1975) and these documents reflect the influence of the Hall-Dennis Report. In the chapter describing the values, goals and objectives of the educational system, it is stated in Education in the Primary and Junior Division that "it is the policy of the Government of Ontario that every child be granted the opportunity to develop as completely as possible in keeping with his or her talents and needs."[11] The policy documents reflect the curriculum orientation

and methodology advocated in Living and Learning.

The Hall-Dennis Report forced educators into re-examining how children learned and how they ought to be taught. A major section of the report discussed "the learning experience" and stressed the value of discovery-learning and the child-centred curriculum. In discussing the nature and acquisition of knowledge, the authors rejected the traditional notion that knowledge is something that has an independent existence which can be transmitted. They believed that organizing courses of study for children into traditional subjects often led to pressure being put on pupils to memorize passively irrelevant material. Thus, the curriculum that was advocated in the report expressed more concern for "the learning experience of the pupil" than for traditional academic orientations to subject matter. The change in perspective was not intended to be anti-academic but rather it was intended to be a redefinition of emphasis and focus for the school curriculum.

Obviously a redefinition of the school curriculum necessitated a re-examination of the role of the teacher. A major section of the report was devoted to describing "the world of teaching" and the changing role of the teacher.[13] Recognition was given to the importance of the teacher's role in implementing the report's philosophy and improvements in teacher education programs were seen as the primary means by which reform of the educational system could be effected. With the Hall-Dennis Report, teachers were being asked to teach and implement a philosophy of education that they had not experienced in

their own schooling. In light of the philosophy of the report, teacher educators had to reconsider what were the requisite skills for teaching and the appropriate means of developing the necessary skills and attitudes in neophyte teachers. If teachers were to function effectively in the roles advocated by the Committee, teacher educators had the dual task of fostering in student teachers the ability to understand and critically appraise the educational issues and philosophy described in the report and, at the same time, provide student teachers with the opportunities to observe, practise and refine pedagogical techniques required of the teacher who was to function as a facilitator and a guide of learning.[14]

Investigations by the MacLeod Committee and the Hall-Dennis Committee overlapped by approximately one year. The Hall-Dennis Committee was able to take into consideration the recommendations outlined in the MacLeod Report and endorsed the MacLeod Report's major recommendation which advocated that teacher education be under the auspices of universities. Both reports called for teacher education to be a four-year program combining academic and professional studies. Both reports urged the universities to develop imaginative and innovative teacher education programs and both reports advised that diverse paths to teacher certification were desirable. The Hall-Dennis Committee also went on to make a strong case for the necessity of continuing teacher education and maintained that time and financial support should be available for teachers to participate in seminars, workshops, conferences and part-time courses. The close juxtaposition

of the Hall-Dennis and MacLeod Reports tended to reinforce the position that reform of elementary teacher training programs was imperative.

E. The Retention of O.T.E.C.

Between 1969 and 1973, the academic prerequisites for admission to elementary teacher training were progressively raised until in 1973 an acceptable university degree was required. Any student being trained in a consecutive program was presumed to have an adequate academic background for teaching because he or she must have spent a minimum of three years in a university community developing academic scholarship and maturity. Several of the newly formed faculties of education developed concurrent programs. However, the majority of teacher candidates in the 1970's were graduated from consecutive programs -- apparently showing a preference for completing their academic studies before pursuing professional training. If all of the prospective teachers had a university degree and the majority of them preferred a consecutive program, then a question could be raised about the reasons for and advantages of maintaining professional training exclusively within the university structure. It was precisely this question that the Ministry of Education had to address in 1973-74 when the decision was being made regarding the future of Toronto and Hamilton Teachers' Colleges.

The Hall-Dennis Report necessitated that teacher educators re-examine the relationship between theory and practice in the design of teacher education programs. To meet the needs of beginning teachers in the post Hall-Dennis era, teacher training programs had to have strong theoretical and practical components. In the early 1970's, as the first graduates from the newly formed faculties of education

were being hired, there was some criticism from the field that the teachers being trained in the universities did not have enough field experience and pedagogy. In response to such criticism, and desiring to retain control over access to one teacher training institution, the Minister of Education decided to create the Ontario Teacher Education College (O.T.E.C.) to replace the Hamilton and Toronto Teachers' Colleges. In his statement to the Ontario Legislature announcing the creation of O.T.E.C. on June 4, 1974, the Minister of Education, Thomas Wells, said:

> "As has been the case at every step of the integration process, we have analysed the implications of this policy with extreme care. . . particularly since any integration of Hamilton and Toronto teachers' colleges with universities would remove any direct involvement of the Ministry of Education in the process of preparing teachers for Ontario classrooms."[15]

The Minister noted that the graduates of the College would receive a Bachelor of Education degree in addition to a teaching certificate and committed O.T.E.C. to a program of flexibility and experimentation in teacher education. O.T.E.C. was to be primarily field oriented and an advisory committee was set up to "recommend specific measures which will add to the status and quality of the new Ontario Teacher Education College."[16]

Since its creation, several innovative programs and procedures have been piloted at O.T.E.C. For example, before implementing the cyclical review procedures announced by the Minister in his 1975-76 fiscal report in the universities, the Ministry tested the proposed procedures at O.T.E.C. When it became apparent that enrolment in

teacher training institutions ought to be curbed in 1976-1977, O.T.E.C. instituted extensive screening procedures for prospective students which included computation and literacy tests and extensive interviews with college and field personnel.

Both the Hall-Dennis Committee and the MacLeod Committee advised that diversified teacher education programs be generated. In reporting on the design of professional programs, the MacLeod Report stated, "The committee recognizes that no one pattern of professional education has proved to be the most effective. It believes that Colleges of Education should have considerable freedom and flexibility to develop distinctive programs."[17] By 1974, a diverse pattern of teacher education had emerged and in the intervening years since the publication of the two reports a major transformation had occurred in teacher training in Ontario. Not only had consecutive and concurrent programs been developed in faculties of education within the university context, but O.T.E.C. provided an alternative, consecutive program outside of the university context. During the period a sense of lively competition entered into the delivery of teacher education programs, with many good results which included easier accessibility, a variety of quality programs and a great emphasis on research and evaluation. To some extent, as far as teacher education programs were concerned, the promise of the MacLeod Report and Living and Learning had been realized.

F. The York University Model

The York University model is worthy of special note for two reasons:

1. the unique program that was developed at the university;
2. the conflict that ensued re the retention and deployment of the former Lakeshore Teachers' College staff.

York University was the one university which implemented only a concurrent model of teacher education. York made no provision for a consecutive program, such as those that evolved at other universities. In his monograph Teaching Teachers Teaching (1974), Wilf Wees extols the virtues and innovative format of the York University model. The model makes interesting use of a relatively small full-time Faculty of Education, faculty cross-appointed from the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and adjunct professors appointed from the field. The structure of the program included the foundations subjects being taught in the Arts and Sciences Faculty, with the educational implications being discussed in seminars and the students spending one day per week and an annual three-week session out in the schools under the supervision of adjunct professors. The York University Faculty decided to send students only to those schools pursuing a program of open education and this decision reflects the Faculty's commitment to the current trends in education and the recommendations of the Hall-Dennis Report. Wees summarized his description of the York University program by saying:

> "In the York plan, the university, the faculty, the school system, teachers and their federation are involved, one quite as much as any other, in the education of new teachers. The plan has operated for only a year. Before endorsing it, most readers may wish to wait a while and see; however, the York University operation comes as close as any proposal is likely to come to heeding the UNESCO International Commission's recommendations that teacher education should produce 'educators rather than specialists in transmitting pre-established curricula'."[18]

The York University model probably represents a paradigm example of the type of concurrent program the MacLeod Committee recommended be developed.

In spite of the careful guidelines and negotiations regarding the transfer of teachers' college staffs into the universities that were worked out between the Ministry of Education and the Council of University Presidents, serious disagreements developed between York University and the staff transferred from the former Lakeshore Teachers' College. It is not within the scope or purpose of this study to reiterate the arguments and counter-arguments that emerged in the dispute. With the exception of the former principal of Lakeshore Teachers' College, whose services were retained by York University, and those who retired or secured other employment in the interim, in accordance with the agreed-upon guidelines all former Lakeshore staff were notified at the end of their third year with York that they would not be receiving tenured positions with the Faculty of Education at York and consequently their contracts were terminated at the end of their fourth year. The Lakeshore staff believed that they had not been dealt with fairly. Consequently one member of the former Lakeshore

staff took action and proceeded to take a test case to the Supreme Court of Ontario and sued York University for damages. Ultimately the Court upheld the position of York University, but the case points out the very intense personal, political and legal problems that can emerge when changes such as the closing or transferring of teachers' colleges (or any other such institution, for that matter) take place.

G. Developments in Secondary School Teacher Education

Compared to elementary teacher training, secondary school teacher training has been relatively unaffected by the Hall-Dennis Report. However, in accordance with the Hall-Dennis philosophy and recommendations, the secondary school curriculum has become more flexible and broader in scope. Secondary school students are able to choose courses from the four major categories of Communications, Social and Environmental Studies, Pure and Applied Sciences and the Arts in order to tailor a program of study to meet their own interests and abilities.

The more flexible curriculum in the secondary schools has brought about a proliferation of new courses and therefore the options offered at the secondary school training institutions for prospective teachers reflect the broader curriculum. However, the secondary school curriculum is still organized essentially in a vertical fashion -- that is, in specific subject areas rather than on the more horizontal and integrated approach of the elementary school. Consequently, the certification of secondary school teachers still reflects the subject orientation of the secondary school curriculum.

Just as Standard 1, 2, 3 or 4 is used to indicate the academic standing required to qualify for each of the Interim Elementary School Teacher's certificates, so Type A or Type B is used to point out the academic standing and teacher education program required to qualify for each of the Interim High School Assistant's certificates. Whereas an acceptable university degree will qualify a candidate academically for the Type B Certificate, a candidate for the Interim High School

Assistant's Certificate, Type A, must hold a four-year degree (60 credits) beyond the Secondary School Honour Graduation Diploma level with at least second class standing and a concentration of at least twenty-seven credits in one specialist field or at least forty-two credits in two specialist fields, with not fewer than eighteen credits in each. The specialist fields are: agriculture, anthropology, anglais, art, biology, chemistry, computer science, dramatic or theatre arts, economics, English, français, French, geography, geology, German, Greek, history, home economics, Italian, Latin, mathematics, music, physical and health education, physics, political science, psychology, Russian, sociology, Spanish. In the case of programs leading to the Interim Vocational Certificate, Type A and Type B, and the Interim Occupational Certificate, Type A and Type B, the academic requirements for the Type A programs are considerably higher than those demanded for admission to the Type B programs.

As has been mentioned earlier, the shortage of adequately qualified secondary school teachers continued throughout the sixties. In order to have an adequate supply of qualified secondary school teachers, special summer school courses were offered from 1955 to 1968 to university graduates who had been employed as teachers by boards of education. The emergency summer school program had both its critics and its defenders. However, as the demand for teachers began to decrease and more students could be accommodated in full-time courses at colleges or faculties of education, the emergency summer courses for academic teachers were phased out.

Besides instituting special summer courses to secure an adequate supply of secondary school teachers, the Ministry of Education also embarked on an expansion program. Influenced by the recommendations of the Patten Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers (1962), the Department of Education negotiated agreements with the University of Western Ontario and Queen's University and renegotiated its agreement with the University of Toronto to establish colleges or faculties of education to provide a one-year consecutive program for the training of secondary school teachers. Ultimately agreements were reached with other universities to establish faculties of education to provide training for both elementary and secondary school teachers. Currently, of the eleven teacher training institutions, eight train both elementary and secondary school teachers, three* train elementary school teachers only, and there are no institutions that train only secondary school teachers.

In the post Hall-Dennis era there appears to be one anomaly in the pattern of certifying teachers -- namely that of the elementary option program offered by some faculties of education. The elementary option program allows a prospective teacher to acquire certification for both elementary and secondary school teaching in one academic year. Given the divergence of methodologies and approaches to curriculum that are appropriate for elementary and secondary school teaching, it appears as if a prospective teacher could profitably spend the whole

---

*O.T.E.C. (Hamilton and Toronto campuses) is counted as one institution here.

training experience preparing to teach in either the elementary or the secondary school.* If the elementary option program is phased out, then the faculties of education offering the program face serious problems. If the elementary option programs are expanded into full elementary training programs, it would appear that these programs might be redundant considering the projected declining enrolments in the elementary schools. If the elementary option programs are phased out, then the faculties of education might face problems redeploying the tenured staff who had been teaching on the elementary option program. Neither option is attractive, but continuing to offer programs of dual certification for teachers when there is an adequate cohort of qualified teachers to function in all divisions of the public school system also seems to be unsatisfactory.

---

*In 1977, 3267 elementary school teachers graduated from the one-year program. 3639 secondary school teachers were graduated from the one-year program and of those 936 took the elementary option. Thus, 25 per cent of the students taking secondary school teacher training received dual certification

H. Committee on the Costs of Education

In June 1971, Minister of Education Robert Welch appointed a committee, to be chaired by T.A. McEwan, to examine the costs of education. The Committee on the Costs of Education was to examine expenditures in education in relation to the aims and objectives of the educational system and to evaluate programs in terms of present-day needs and costs of implementation. To date, the seven-member Committee has not tabled its final report. However, in the intervening years since receiving its mandate, the Committee has submitted seven interim reports to the government on various aspects of the costs of education -- e.g., transportation costs, demographic influences on school enrolments, school building programs. The two reports that are of the most interest for this study are Interim Report Number One (1972) and Interim Report Number Five (1977).

The first report that the McEwan Committee wrote dealt specifically with the problems and costs of teacher education. The McEwan Committee believed, as had the Hall-Dennis and MacLeod committees before them, that effective teacher education programs were necessary prerequisites for developing competent teachers and quality education. Much of the first report was devoted to a detailed examination of teacher education facilities, teacher withdrawals and acquisitions, and projected pupil enrolments.

The Committee recognized that the projected need for new graduate teachers would decline until 1978-79 and therefore recommended that the excess capacity of places to train teachers be reduced by closing

four teachers' colleges -- namely, those at Stratford, Peterborough, Hamilton and Ottawa. Among the thirty-four recommendations that were made in this 1972 report, the Committee advised that:

(a) the number of teacher education institutions be reduced;

(b) the buildings and sites no longer required be disposed of by sale or transfer to other institutions;

(c) payment to associate teachers be discontinued;

(d) students be charged regular tuition fees in teacher training institutions;

(e) the Elementary School Option program be discontinued;

(f) the Teacher Education Branch be reorganized and responsibility for pre-service and in-service teacher training be transferred to faculties and colleges of education.[19]

Not all of the recommendations in the Interim Report Number One have been implemented. As has been mentioned earlier, only two teachers' colleges were closed, not four as recommended. Associate teachers are still paid for their services and the Elementary Option program was available to the students in 1977-78.

In the Interim Report Number Five, the McEwan Committee reiterated the recommendation that the Ministry of Education should not provide any direct service for pre-service and in-service teacher education. The Committee argued that the role of the Ministry ought to be one of providing services which only the Ministry can perform (e.g., legislation, grants, teacher certification) and of providing a leadership role through consultation and liaison for interested educational organizations and agencies. The Committee did not argue that the Ministry should divest

itself of its teacher training function because of the costs that are involved, but rather because existing faculties of education are especially qualified to provide these services. There is no evidence to suggest that it costs more to train a teacher in a Ministry-operated college than in a university, or that the program offered by a Ministry-operated college is inferior to those provided by the universities.

Cost must be one factor -- but not the only factor -- in determining whether or not the Ministry should divest itself of pre-service and in-service teacher education. Before accepting the argument and the recommendation of the McEwan Committee regarding the Ministry's involvement in teacher training, greater consideration must be given to the problems and strategies of policy implementation in education. At present the Ministry-operated institutions serve a dual function, the second of which should not be underestimated:

1. of providing direct service in the training of both pre-service and in-service teachers;
2. of disseminating Ministry policy to the educational community.

By eliminating the Ministry's direct teacher training service, an avenue for dialogue with the educational community regarding policy-making and implementation would be closed.

At this time it is difficult to assess the impact of the McEwan Reports on educational policy development. The McEwan Reports have not initiated the widespread public debates which the Hall-Dennis Report did. Furthermore, the McEwan Reports investigate a much

broader range of topics and problems than did the MacLeod Report. As far as the McEwan Committee's recommendations regarding teacher education are concerned, all that can be said at present is that some have been implemented while, as yet, others have not. There are many complex political, economic and educational factors that make the implementation of such recommendations as those included in the McEwan Reports a long and difficult process.

I. Summary

For teacher education the period from 1966 to 1976 was a decade of transition and change. The MacLeod Report and the Hall-Dennis Report heralded new structures and orientations for teacher education. Viable alternative teacher education programs developed within faculties of education and the Ministry-operated teachers' college. The three proposals for the design of teacher education programs outlined in the MacLeod Report were implemented and the internship plan is the only proposal not currently in operation.

Substantial time and money were invested in developing teacher training facilities so that there would be a sufficient supply of highly trained teachers for Ontario's schools. With the declining enrolments in the public school system, Ontario's teacher training facilities have the capacity to train more teachers than the system can productively absorb.

In 1969, when discussing the "official report" as an instrument of educational reform, Douglas Myers expressed the hope that the opportunity would not be lost "to examine fundamentally the extremely complex question of the most effective education and training for teachers".[20] In 1978, with a policy of retrenchment facing educational institutions and with criticism being levelled at the public educational system, another opportunity has been presented for the examination of the fundamental issues concerning teacher education. Any educational program or system must undergo examination, criticism and reflection if improvements are to made and quality maintained.

Educators must not shy away from re-examining fundamental principles when the opportunities are presented. Teacher educators are presently facing such an opportunity.

Notes

1. Ontario Economic Council, Issues and Alternatives, Education, Toronto, 1976, p. 33. In the chart indicating enrolment in the Ontario education system (1964-65 to 1974-75), the Council shows a drop in enrolment in elementary and secondary schools from a total of 2,083,951 in 1971-72 to 2,051,717 in 1974-75 -- a decline of 32,234. The decline in enrolment had a major impact on the number of teachers needed to staff the schools. The Ministry of Education statistics on teacher withdrawals and acquisitions indicate that 1,789 fewer teachers were employed as of September 30, 1974 than as of September 30, 1971.

2. Ontario. Department of Education, Report of the Minister of Education for the Fiscal Year 1975-76, p. 5.

3. Ontario. Department of Education, Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers (chaired by C.R. MacLeod), Report, Toronto, 1966, p. 1.

4. Ibid., p. 11.

5. Ibid., p. 12.

6. Ibid., p. 53.

7. Ibid.

8. W.G. Fleming, Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. III: Schools, Pupils and Teachers, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971, p. 499.

9. Ontario. Department of Education, Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario (co-chaired by Justice E.M. Hall and Lloyd Dennis), Report, Living and Learning, Toronto: Newton Publishing Co., 1968, p. 4.

10. Ibid., p. 179

11. Ontario. Ministry of Education, Education in the Primary and Junior Division, Toronto, 1975, p. 5.

12. Ontario. Department of Education, Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario, Report, Living and Learning, p. 75.

13. Ibid., pp. 121-145.

14. Ibid., pp. 123-128.

15. Ontario, Legislative Assembly, Debates, Toronto: Queen's Printer, Tuesday, June 4, 1974, Afternoon Session, p. 2827.

16. Ibid., p. 2827.

17. Ontario. Department of Education, Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers, Report, p. 24.

18. Wilf Wees, Teaching Teachers Teaching, Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1974, p. 43.

19. Ontario. Ministry of Education, Committee on the Costs of Education (chaired by T.A. McEwan), Interim Report Number One, Toronto, 1972, p. 63-67.

20. Douglas Myers, "From Hope to Hall-Dennis: the official report as an instrument of educational reform", in Means and Ends in Education, ed. by Brian Crittenden, Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1969, p. 22.

Part V

CONCLUDING REMARKS

During the past fifteen years teacher education has not only experienced an unprecedented quantitative growth but an equally high degree of qualitative progress. This progress was reflected in the numerous reforms recommended, respectively, by the Patten Committee for secondary school teacher training and the MacLeod Committee for elementary school teacher training. Furthermore, in the 1960's, a reorganization of the educational system initiated by the then Minister of Education William Davis and supported by a progressive philosophy of education facilitated the development of a diversified and decentralized teacher education program. The result has permitted a more effective response on the part of teacher training institutions to the multiplicity of educational needs of the different parts of the province. It is hoped that whatever policy is formulated and implemented in response to the demands of what has become a contracting educational system it will be such as not to undermine the qualitative achievements of the last fifteen years. Four years ago, the members of the McEwan Committee on the Costs of Education expressed the same view:

> "With the decline in enrolments now being experienced and the consequent de-emphasis on expansion, it is imperative that provision be made for integrated comprehensive planning of all aspects of the educational enterprise including curriculum, teacher education, special education, educational technology, school buildings, and the like. The opportunity now exists for renewed attention to the qualitative aspects of education."[1]

Emphasis must be placed on refinement of what has already been produced and achieved in terms of both theory and practice. The crisis due to declining enrolments must be turned into an opportunity for internal growth and development.

Developments in teacher education for the last century in Ontario have been determined to a considerable extent by the forces of supply and demand. Repeatedly there has been a lowering of academic standards or an introduction of emergency measures to ensure an adequate supply of teachers for the classrooms of the province's schools. Conditions in the 1970's have changed significantly in that the existing teacher training facilities can meet the projected needs for teachers for at least the next decade. It is evident from the McEwan Committee's Interim Report Number One (1972) that knowledge of declining enrolments and their effect on teacher education has been available for some time. Had this information been taken seriously in the early 1970's, it should have provided both government and the teacher training institutions with sufficient data to effect appropriate changes in admissions policy. Obviously this did not occur. Consequently, as the rate of enrolment in the schools of Ontario continues to decline, admission quotas at O.T.E.C. and faculties of education should be determined by actual and short-term projected demand rather than by a protectionist policy on the part of those in control of the system.

Notwithstanding the vast improvement that has occurred in the quality of teacher education since the days of Robert Phillips in The Path We Came By[2], the motivation of a great number of candidates seeking admission into the profession has not changed significantly. As in Robert Phillips' days, many continue to select the teaching profession as a vocation of last resort or as a stepping-stone to a more remunerative career. In light of the limited opportunities that will exist in the profession on account of declining enrolments, it is

imperative that the few new teachers who are admitted be carefully screened to ensure the development of a teaching corps that is not only highly competent but also deeply committed to the tasks of education.

Moreover, since there are now more candidates presenting themselves for training than can be absorbed into the teaching profession, it would be a most valuable exercise to provide anew sound and relevant answers to the following fundamental questions:

1. What ought to be the nature of teacher education programs?
2. Who ought to be trained as teachers? What academic, personal and professional characteristics ought prospective teachers demonstrate before admission to teacher training programs?
3. How ought prospective teachers be identified? What selection procedures, if any, should be used to determine eligible candidates for teacher training?
4. Who ought to teach the teachers -- academics, administrators and supervisory personnel, classroom teachers, or "teacher-educators"?
5. Who ought to control the number of admissions?

How these questions are answered will affect the development of education in general and teacher education in particular for decades to come. For the first time in many years, it appears that policies and programs of teacher education need no longer be governed by the perennial problem long associated with teacher education -- the chronic shortage of adequately qualified candidates presenting themselves for teacher training.

Notes

1. Ontario. Ministry of Education, Committee on the Costs of Education (chaired by T.A. McEwan), Interim Report Number Four, Toronto, 1974, p. 4.

2. See pp. 8-12.

Bibliography

Althouse, J.G., The Ontario Teacher 1800-1910, Toronto: W.J. Gage Ltd., 1967, (D.Paed. Thesis, Univ. of Toronto, 1929).

Canada. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Salaries and Qualifications of Teachers in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools 1965-66, Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1968.

_____. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Teachers' Salaries and Qualifications in Nine Provinces 1950, Ottawa: Queen's Printer and Controller of Stationary, 1952.

Dutton, Sheila M., "The Development of the Faculty of Education at York University 1965-1972," unpublished paper, the University of Toronto Higher Education Group, 1973.

Fleming, W.G., Education: Ontario's Preoccupation, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972.

_____. Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. VII: Educational Contributions of Associations, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1972.

_____. Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. V: Supporting Institutions and Services, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971.

_____. Ontario's Educative Society/Vol. III: Schools, Pupils and Teachers, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971.

_____. Ontario's Educative Society/Vol.I: The Expansion of the Educational System, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1971.

Goulson, Carlyn F., "An Historical Survey of Royal Commissions and Other Major Governmental Inquiries in Canadian Education," unpublished Ed.D. Thesis, Univ. of Toronto, 1966.

Great Britain. Committee on Higher Education (chaired by Lord Robbins) 1961-63, Report, London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963.

Harris, Robin S., Quiet Evolution, Toronto: Univ. of Toronto Press, 1967.

Hodgins, J. George, ed., Documentary History of Education in Upper Canada (Ontario)... 1791-1876, Toronto: Warwick & S. Rutter, 1894-1910, 28 vols.

_____. Ryerson Memorial Volume, Toronto: Warwick & Sons, 1889.

Jackson, R.W.B. and Rivers, F.S., "Teacher Supply in Canada," in Canadian Education, Vol. VIII, No. 3(June, 1953), pp. 3-21.

Myers, Douglas, "From Hope to Hall-Dennis: the official report as an instrument of Educational reform," in Means and Ends in Education, ed. by Brian Crittenden, Occasional Papers 2, Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1969, pp. 11-24.

National Education Association of the United States. National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards, Bowling Green Conference Report, The Education of Teachers. New Perspectives, Washington, D.C., 1958.

Newcombe, Ervin Ernest, "The Development of the Elementary School Teacher in Ontario Since 1900," unpublished Ed.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1965.

Ontario. Department of Education, Reports of the Minister of Education, Toronto, 1876-1976.

_____. Education in the Primary and Junior Division, Toronto, 1975.

_____. The Formative Years, Toronto, 1975.

_____. Provincial Committee on Aims and Objectives of Education in the Schools of Ontario (co-chaired by Justice E.M. Hall and Lloyd Dennis), Report, Living and Learning, Toronto: Newton Publishing Co., 1968.

_____. Minister's Committee on the Training of Elementary School Teachers (chaired by C.R. MacLeod), Report, Toronto, 1966.

_____. Memoranda 1964-65.

_____. Report of the Minister's Committee on the Training of Secondary School Teachers, Toronto, 1962.

_____. Royal Commission on Education (chaired by Justice John Andrew Hope), Report, Toronto: King's Printer, 1950.

_____. Legislative Assembly, Debates, Toronto: Queen's Printer, Tuesday, June 4, 1974, Afternoon Session.

_____. Ministry of Education, Committee on the Costs of Education (chaired by T.A. McEwan), Interim Report Number Five, Toronto, 1977.

_____. Committee on the Costs of Education (chaired by T.A. McEwan), Interim Report Number Four, Toronto, 1974.

_____. Committee on the Costs of Education (chaired by T.A. McEwan), Interim Report Number One, Toronto, 1972.

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, First Annual Report of the Board of Governors 1965-66, Toronto, 1966.

_____. Report of the Director 1967/68, Toronto, 1969.

Ontario Normal School Teachers' Association, A Report on the Normal Schools of the Province of Ontario, by a committee of the Association, Toronto, 1950.

Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation, A Programme for Teacher Education in Ontario, by a committee of the Federation, Toronto, 1950.

Ontario Teachers' College Association, Suggested Changes in the One-Year Course at the Ontario Teachers' Colleges, report of the staff conference held at Toronto Teachers' College, April 1-2, 1964.

Palmer, R.R., The Age of the Democratic Revolution. A Political History of Europe and America, Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press, 1959.

Ryerson, Egerton, Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada, Montreal: Lovell and Gibson, 1847.

Semmel, Bernard, The Methodist Revolution, New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973.

_____. "Elie Halévy, Methodism and Revolution", Introduction to Elie Halévy, The Birth of Methodism in England, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1971.

Stevens, Robert A., The Path We Came By, Great Britian: Stellar Press Hatfield Herts, 1973.

Wees, Wilf, Teaching Teachers Teaching, Toronto: Canadian Education Association, 1974.